

# THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT,  
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

---

Vol. XVIII

JUNE, 1929

No. 108

---

## EDITORIAL

### HELLENIC PILGRIMS

Six months ago we published an article by the present writer on his impressions of a visit to America and Canada last summer. Today we ask our readers' indulgence for a few words upon the lessons of a very different kind of tour, namely a cruise to Greece and the Ægean under the auspices of the Hellenic Travellers Club. We speak of impressions in the one case, and of lessons in the other, because in fact the experiences were so different. Last year our visit was to the young countries of the West, both of them in many ways homogeneous with our own; only a fringe of them could be touched, and we could not claim to see far beneath the surface. But the traveller who goes East is bound to tell a different story. For here, in the Eastern Mediterranean, he is in the cockpit of history, where Phœnicia and Egypt, Greece and Persia, Europe and Asia, Christendom and Islam have said their say and gone their way. Here you can see what man has made of his life, and what God has done with man, over thousands of years of time. The traveller brings to it in all probability a good substratum of knowledge derived from his schooldays; he may indeed be seeing places and things that he has long imagined, and desired to see; not only are the lessons he can learn of universal moment, but he is, at least in some sort, equipped to learn them. Here he cannot fail to realize how near are life and death, how close is the beauty of earth to the mortality of man and his civilizations, and how the creativeness of the human spirit is mated at every turn with the sorrow of ruin and decay. The truth is well known to historians; no lesson stands more plainly out of the pages of Scripture than that "here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come." But the truth comes home to us when we see its evidences with our own eyes on every side.



Here, for instance, on one day we steamed, on our good ship *Stella d'Italia*, past Mitylene, "where burning Sappho loved and sang"; Chios, the reputed birthplace of Homer, the father of poetry; the bay of Ephesus, where St. Paul planted and St. John watered the Christian Church; just out of sight was Patmos, where the seer of the Apocalypse was in exile; and on the next morning we stood on the ruin of Minos' palace at Knossos, reaching back to 4000 B.C., the seed-plot of European civilization. So many birthplaces of the spirit of Man! And yet each birthplace was also a tomb. Today no Christian Church survives in Ephesus or the neighbourhood to offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; the gorgeous palace of Minos was destroyed in a decade, after 3,000 years of history; Chios still mourns the massacre of a century ago. Or again we are standing in beautiful Delphi, for over a thousand years the centre of Greek religion, where men came from all over Greece and from far beyond it to consult the oracle on every kind of matter, public or private. But our lecturer\* cannot but close by reminding us of its last recorded answer, when in the fourth century the Emperor Julian, seeking to revive paganism, came to it for guidance: "Go, tell the king, the glorious dwelling is fallen to earth; no longer has Apollo his cell . . . the water-springs that spake are quenched and dead."

Constantinople tells a similar tale, but with a double emphasis. On the one hand, the ruined but still massive walls and towers of Justinian and his successors, and the ancient churches, now profaned with the emblems of sacrilege and distorted to an alien worship, proclaim the downfall of the Byzantine Empire. On the other, the power that reared itself on those ruins is also perishing. With the exception of the Seraskerai and the great mosques, Stamboul today is a city in the doldrums. Along every street you come across patches of desert and decay, where none have cared to rebuild the houses that time or fire has destroyed; the once-famous bazaars contain little but the cast-off wares of Birmingham or East London; no dash of colour diversifies the drab clothing of an artificially Westernized population; hooded crows hover or perch above, waiting for their carrion. Pera and Galata still show signs of prosperity and life, and the Golden Horn is still beautiful in the sun: but the main city seems as though under sentence of death, until a new power shall arise to re-create it. It is a microcosm of the Eastern Mediterranean, only with the

\* The Rev. W. A. Wigram, D.D. No impressions of this cruise would be complete without an expression of the deep gratitude felt by all the travellers to Dr. Wigram for his instructive and inspiring lectures.



dark colours made more dark—everywhere the signs of man's courage and hope and creativeness, crossed by the bar sinister of change and instability and self-destruction. When all is said and done, it is not time, but man, that has been the destroyer: the universality of sin rather than of change is what is impressed upon one. The words of the Eastern thinker come to mind, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity"; and we cannot wonder that the disciples of Epicurus should have come to say, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die."

---

And yet, is that all? Surely not. There are balancing factors, and for a just philosophy of history they tip the scale. In the first place, all the beauties of nature, which are reflected in the poetry and architecture of Greece, are still there unspoilt. The clear outline of mountain and island, as seen from the Acropolis or in the Ægean; the wine-dark sea; the snows on Ida; the rich olive-clad valleys and slopes; the veins of marble in the cliffs—these things endure. Man may be a cheat, but the works of God are still beyond cavil. But there is more to be said even than that. The very glories that have died have died to live: indeed, it seems a law of human culture that its outward downfall is the condition of its wider diffusion. Minos' palace has gone; but scholars tell us that it was the Minoan culture which underlay the renaissance of Greek art in the classical age. At Athens, the Parthenon and the Erectheum stand as the last lovely embodiments of a golden era; but the greatest influence of the city's genius was to come only later, after Alexander had hellenized the then known world, made Greek the *lingua franca* of civilization, and sown broadcast the Athenian ideals of freedom, knowledge, and clarity in thought and expression. Horace was right when he wrote, "Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit. . . ." Athens had died to live.

---

Or take Constantinople. The city was itself the scene of the second Ecumenical Council; not many miles eastward Nicea witnessed the gathering which more than any other determined the character of the Christian religion; across the strait at Scutari, called of old Chalcedon, the doctrine of Christ received its completest dogmatic formulation. Constantinople, that is to say, was a bastion of Christianity as a system of truth before ever it was a bastion of Christianity as an empire; and the truths it stood for have long survived the downfall of Byzantium. We may criticize its formulations, if we will; and in some respects it must be admitted that the issues were couched in terms which we should not use today. But the decision of the issues as then



presented was such as not only to protect the central fact and experience of our faith, namely the worship of Christ, but also to ensure for all time that this same worship should be of the whole man, given with the mind no less than the heart. More than any other element in Christian history, it was Byzantine Greece, with its councils and its theologians, which ensured that Christianity should challenge not only the heart but the intellect of the world, and claim acceptance not as a form of sentiment but as a revelation of truth. And few would question the statement that the truth of the Gospel has had a freer course and a wider diffusion, since it ceased to be linked too closely with the fortunes of the Eastern Empire.

"Here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come." The insecurity and mortality writ so large across the pages of history, and illustrated so lavishly in the lands surrounding the Ægean, proclaim man not only frail, but also an exile from his true home. We are "sojourners and pilgrims" here, not meant for earth alone, and spurred on by *la nostalgie de l'infini*. It is the lesson which we associate especially in modern times with Pascal; among our own recent theologians Dr. Moberly gave it exquisite expression in his *Sorrow, Sin, and Beauty*. Two experiences brought it vividly home to us on our recent tour. One was at the Russian Refugees' restaurant in Pera, where, during luncheon, we listened to folk-songs and other music from a Russian choir of ten men, many of them of noble birth, who accompanied themselves with banjos. The music broke in upon us with extraordinary emotional effect, a veritable rhapsody of grief and courage, seeming to come from an infinite sorrow and to ask for an infinite pity such as only heaven could satisfy; the utterance of a patriotism of more than earthly mould, calling for a better country and a heavenly city whose maker and builder is God. It pointed not onwards to any redress such as history might bring, but upwards to a home beyond the confines of change and time. Equally memorable in its way was a little ceremony at Suvla Bay, where a wreath of white and scarlet flowers was gently dropped to the waves, to the accompaniment of prayers, and with our Italian officers standing at the salute; and there we watched it bobbing on the tide, and drifting towards that

corner of a foreign field  
That is for ever England.

Sentiment? Yes, perhaps: and yet such sentiment as lifts the heart to unseen realms of peace.



It has sometimes been pointed out that the security which we prize so highly in modern life is something which the ancients neither believed in nor expected, nor even, if they were Christian, seem to have coveted. Certainly Crete and Delphi, Athens and Constantinople, give little credence to its possibility. "Here have we no continuing city." Might we paraphrase this by saying that we are bound to be one of two things—either tourists or pilgrims? Outwardly they are much alike, enjoying constant movement, change of scene, novel sensations and experiences. But there is a vital difference of motive; for all the pilgrim's experiences are knit by a thread of purpose. He has an objective, and his objective is religious: he seeks spiritual refreshment and strength. So the Christian, passing through the changes and chances of this mortal life, is no butterfly, sipping pleasures here and there, but rather a stranger and a pilgrim, because through all his experiences his eyes are set upon an unseen country; and he presses

On to the bound of the waste,  
On to the city of God.

---

A word may be added on another lesson which the tour impressed on our minds. No doubt the magnificence of Gibbon's style is no longer the snare that it was; for people today do not read big books. But, for ourselves, we are bound to confess that it was not until a visit to Constantinople compelled a new study of its history that we realized how gravely erroneous was the general impression left by Gibbon's work. Some of our readers may be still under Gibbon's spell. If so, may we suggest a reading (or re-reading) of Bury's *History of the Later Roman Empire* and of the present Dean of Winchester's *Constantinople in the Mediæval Towns* series? To these might be added a very recent book by a young author, Robert Byron, entitled *The Byzantine Achievement*, which will illustrate the swing of the pendulum still further. And if lighter literature may be mentioned, *The Beauty of the Purple*, by W. S. Davis (1925), is an historical novel concerned with Leo the Isaurian, which the reader will find it quite impossible, once he has begun it, to put down. The result of such a fresh study of the Byzantine Empire will be, we think, a much enlarged and corrected philosophy of history, and a new respect for the mind and customs of that Eastern Church which was its life and soul, and is still the hope of Eastern Europe.

---



## THOUGHTS ON THE BLESSED TRINITY

## I

THE purpose of this paper is to urge that the Trinity may be envisaged under three aspects, and from three distinct, though closely related, points of view. This would seem to be in accordance with that movement of progressive analysis which is steadily going forward in all sciences, and (not least) in theology itself. If such a case can be made out, if such a position can be established in regard to this classic "locus" of orthodox faith, may it not prove of substantial aid in helping to clear our conceptions in regard to the transcendent Object of our belief—in regard to Him whom we have been taught to recognize as Three and yet One? Would it not be a helpful thing if we were able to achieve a (relatively) independent view-point—and that *on New Testament ground*—so far as the historic Trinitarian dogma is concerned? By so doing, we might objectively and critically evaluate those historic forms and classic modes of interpretation which are presented to us in the dogmas and symbols of the Church.

The fact that this great doctrine is in truth susceptible of various modes of interpretation has given rise to objections on the part of those who are unwilling to recognize the mystery of the Trinity in Unity. I recall a book which appeared a number of years ago—I think its title was *Unitarianism proved from Trinitarian Testimonies*—in which numerous citations were made from orthodox writers and theologians, representing all periods in the history of the Church. The sentences quoted represented the attempt to give expression to the divine mystery of the Three in One. The fact of their variance in the use of terms and in forms of expression was taken as evidence of intellectual failure, and as proof of the futility of the doctrine itself. The argument was this:—that the inconsistency, as between the various theological utterances cited necessarily implied that the dogma of the Trinity was itself contradictory and irrational, and for that reason could not be entertained by any thinking man.

It was along this line of reasoning that the late Professor Levi Leonard Paine, by his book, *The Evolution of Trinitarianism*, wrote himself out of orthodoxy into Socinianism. To him it seemed that the Trinitarianism of Augustine *contradicted* the Trinitarianism of Athanasius; and therefore that the house of orthodoxy, being divided against itself, must necessarily have



fallen. The path along which Dr. Paine's mind moved lay in an opposite direction to that of Newman. For it seems to be generally recognized that in the process of writing his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, Newman succeeded in arguing himself from the Anglican "Via Media" into the position of the Church of Rome.

But, as a matter of fact, does not this variety in the mode of human interpretation naturally and necessarily flow from the transcendent character of the divine Object of our Christian faith? Is it not but another evidence of the truth that God is incomprehensible by the human mind; or (as it has so often been expressed) that this "mystery" of faith is not contrary to reason, even though it eludes our full intellectual comprehension? After all, if God could be completely understood by us, would He not cease to be God?

The New Testament—as Newman has said somewhere—is full of the three divine Names—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. To interpret their relations one to another, and to ourselves, is the task of Christian thought. For our aid in so doing, we must of necessity have recourse to those primary and radical forms of expression which lie at the roots of grammar, and therefore of metaphysics; I refer to the *prepositions*—those particles which are of such critical significance in the Greek New Testament. Such words as "out of" ("ek"), indicating origin; "through" or "by" ("dia"), indicating instrumentality or efficient causality; and "in" or "into" ("en" or "eis"), indicating vital and organic unity, are of primary and supreme importance as determinants of theological thought and means of theological expression.

(1) Let us see how this principle finds illustration in reference to that great Symbol of orthodoxy—the Nicene Creed. Here we find, as the two characteristic prepositions, "ek"—"from" or "out of"—and "dia"—"through" or "by." The Son of God is said to be "God (out) of God," "Light (out) of Light," "very God (from or out) of very God." The Holy Spirit is said to proceed "from," or "out of" the Father; or (as in the Western form of the Symbol, which we have in the Prayer-Book) "from" or "out of" the Father *and the Son*. Moreover, the work of creation is ascribed to the Son in the statement that "through" or "by" Him "all things were made." Here the critical word of relation is that particle which denotes agency or instrumentality,—the word "by" ("dia"), or, as in the Latin version of the Creed, "per"—"per quem omnia facta sunt."

The doctrinal "matrix," or normative passage which has had great influence in determining forms of expression in the



Eastern group or family of Creeds,—to which the “Nicene” Creed of course belongs—is found in the Pauline passage, 1 Cor. viii. 6: “To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things . . . and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things. . . .” The origin of the universe is here ascribed to God the Father, while the agency of creation is attributed to the “one Lord,” Jesus Christ. We find that this passage has left its imprint upon many of the Creeds.\*

For example, the phrase ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα (as distinguished from δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα), is connected with God the Father in the Symbol found in the *Apostolic Constitutions*;† in the Confession of Faith put forth by the Second Synod of Antioch, A.D. 341 (in the third version of that formula);‡ in the Confession put forth by the Synod at Nicæa (in Thrace), A.D. 359;§ and in the Confession of the Synod of Constantinople, A.D. 360. It is also found in the Confession of Faith of Eunomius,|| and in that of St. Basil (the Great).¶

A similar Pauline expression which has also left its mark upon the Creeds is the statement found in Eph. iii. 14, 15: “the Father, from whom all fatherhood in heaven and on earth is named.” This latter statement is embodied in the (fourth form of the) Confession of the Second Synod of Antioch (A.D. 341);\*\* in the Confession put forth by the Synod of Philippopolis (A.D. 343);†† in that of the Third Synod of Antioch (345 A.D.),‡‡ known as the “Ecthesis Makrostichos”; and in that of the First Synod at Sirmium (A.D. 351).§§

In certain of the Eastern group of early Creeds and Confessions, stress is laid upon the *absoluteness of the divine Being*—i.e., of God the Father, from whom the Son and the Spirit proceed. Thus, in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (op. cit., pp. 139, 140): “I believe, and am baptized into one Unbegotten, only, true, God Almighty, the Father of Christ, Creator and Maker of all things, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα.” So in the (conjectural) *Symbol of the Church at Laodicea* (in Syria): “We believe in (the) one and only true God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all (things), both visible and invisible. And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, very God of very God . . .” (ibid., p. 143). So also the *Baptismal Symbol of Cappadocia* (according to Auxentius of Milan): “Credo in unum solum verum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, invisibilem, impassibilem, immortalem, et in Filium ejus unigenitum. . . .” (p. 149).

\* The page references which follow are to Hahn’s collection, *Symbole der alten Kirche*, in which the original texts of the Creeds to which we shall refer may be consulted.

† Pages 139, 140.

|| Pages 260, 261.

†† Page 190.

‡ Page 168.

¶ Page 269.

‡‡ Page 192.

§ Pages 205, 206.

\*\* Page 187.

§§ Page 196.



The two thoughts of the "monism" of God the Father, and also of the inclusiveness of the (Triune) Godhead, are combined in the Coptic Baptismal Confession (pp. 156, 157), to which we shall refer again. The *Ethiopian Baptismal Confession* has: "Credimus in unum Dominum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, et unicum Filium ejus, Jesum Christum, Dominum nostrum, et in Spiritum Sanctum vivificantem . . ." (p. 159). We may also cite the Confession of Faith of a Synod of Antioch put forth in opposition to the teachings of Paul of Samosata: (We believe) "that God is unbegotten, One, without beginning, invisible, unchangeable. . . ." And then the Confession goes on to speak of the "Only-begotten Son," who is the "image of the invisible God" (p. 178). Finally, we refer to the Confession of the Second Antiochene Synod (A.D. 341): "We have learned from the beginning to believe in one God of all, the Maker and Foreknower of all things, both (those which are) intelligible and (those which are) perceptible—*νοητῶν τε καὶ αἰσθητῶν*. And in one Only-begotten Son of God, through whom all things, both visible and invisible, came into existence" (p. 183).

In view of these facts, we are, I think, justified in saying that the Nicene Creed—followed by the "Athanasian" Creed in certain of its clauses—presents us with a "Trinity of origin"—a Trinity which is contemplated from that point of view. The Father is unoriginate; "the Father is of none; neither made, nor created, nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone; neither made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son; not made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding." Three divine Hypostases, of whom One is original and the other Two derivative; the Son derived by "generation," and the Holy Spirit by "procession," three divine Hypostases existing in the unity of the Godhead. Such is the Trinity as presented in that (later) form of the Nicene Creed which we have in the Prayer-Book. It is this formula which gives expression to what may fairly be called the original theological interpretation of the Holy Trinity.

Speaking generally, the Eastern group, or family, of Creeds find their point of departure in *the one God* (the Father), who eternally "generates" the Son, and from whom the Holy Spirit eternally "proceeds." In the language of philosophy, the "Monad" is eternally unfolding into the "Dyad" and the "Triad." The Trinity is an eternal Fact just because of this timeless process, without beginning and without end. In other words, the Trinity of the Eastern Creeds is an evolutionary Trinity.

(2) It is when we turn our attention to the West and to the sphere of Latin Christianity that we find a somewhat different



situation. We find in certain Latin and other vernacular Confessions that the emphasis has come to be laid upon the doctrine of the Trinity as itself the point of departure of the Creed. We are not here speaking, of course, of that earlier group of baptismal Confessions in the West of which the old Roman Symbol is the type, and which find their ultimate and complete expression in that which we know as the "Apostles' Creed." But we speak (in part) of those Conciliar and other official statements in which we find the Triune Being of God, rather than the Person of God the Father, taken as the point of departure. It is *the Trinity* which is "the one God." In order to make this the more emphatic and unmistakable, it is *the Trinity* which is set forth as the "Creator of all things" (Trinitas "creatrix"). The emphasis is laid upon the one "substance" and "power" of the Triune Godhead, by whom "all things were made." A few examples may be given:

(a) From the Confession of the First Council of Toledo (about A.D. 400):

"Credimus in unum Deum, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum, visibilium et invisibilium factorem, per quem creata sunt omnia in cælo et in terra: hunc unum Deum, et hanc unam esse divinæ substantiæ Trinitatem. . . ."

(b) From the Third Council of Toledo (A.D. 589):

"Hæc enim sancta Trinitas unus est Deus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, cujus bonitate omnis licet bona sit condita creatura. . . ."

(c) From the Fourth Council of Toledo (A.D. 633):

"Secundum divinas Scripturas, et doctrinam quam a sanctis patribus accepimus, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum unius deitatis atque substantiæ confitemur; in personarum diversitate Trinitatem credentes; in divinitate unitatem prædicantes, nec 'personas' confundimus, nec 'substantiam' separamus."

(d) From the Sixth Council of Toledo (A.D. 638):

"Credimus et confitemur sacratissimam et omnipotentissimam Trinitatem; Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum; unum Deum; solum, non solitarium. . . ."

(e) The Confession of Faith of Pelagius I., Bishop of Rome: ||

"Credo in unum Deum: Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum. . . ."

\* Hahn, *Symbole*, pp. 209, 210. It was at this First Council of Toledo that the *Filioque* clause was first introduced into the Creed. The clear and definite recognition of the absolute Godhead and Divine Personality of the Holy Spirit, especially as set forth in the *Quicumque Vult*, would seem to have been (broadly speaking) coincident with the recognition of His "procession" from the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, as well as from the First Person.

† *Ibid.*, p. 232.

‡ Page 235.

§ Page 236.

|| Page 334.



(f) The Confession of Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome:\*

"Credo in unum Deum omnipotentem; Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum; tres Personas, unam substantiam. . . ."

As the outstanding and classic example of this mode of presentation, we have the *Quicumque Vult*, with its opening statement of the Trinity as the corner-stone of faith. "The Catholic faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity."

To repeat what has already been said: While in the Eastern Creeds the point of departure is in the affirmation of the "one God, the Father," these Western Confessions make as their initial affirmation God as the "Three in One." In the *Quicumque Vult* the Trinity in unity is first of all expressed, and its meaning developed, before any mention is made of the origin of One divine "Person" as being from Another. Each One of the three divine "Persons" is declared to be "God" in the absolute sense, and yet it is affirmed that "there are not three Gods, but one God."

It is not until we reach the 20th verse (in the passage vers. 20-23) that we find the doctrine of Divine "origination"—whether in the form of "generation" or of "procession"—set forth. Thus the earlier line of interpretation (or doctrinal "tropus") is taken up and (so to speak) grafted upon the later. But it is the earlier section of the *Quicumque* which contains its really characteristic Trinitarian teaching. It is in clauses 3 to 19 that we find the enunciation of the doctrine in that form which was to mean a new point of departure for Trinitarian thought and speculation. This was finally to be worked out in the form of what we have ventured to term the "Trinity of Self-consciousness." The Three "Persons" come to be construed as a threefold Distinction within the one Divine Being. The writer has elsewhere endeavoured to explain this distinction as follows:

"'Person,' in the restricted meaning of the 'ego,' indicates the 'instrumental cause' or the 'means by which' self-consciousness is realized, by which the 'I' is aware of himself as 'I.' The 'substance,' on the other hand, is the 'ground' of consciousness. It includes all that material out of which consciousness is realized; the thoughts, the feelings, the impressions, the volitions which succeed each other in the ever-changing stream of our conscious life."†

In the language of the Creed, while the "substance" is one and indivisible, the personal distinctions are not to be confused, the one with the other—"Neque confundentes personas, neque substantiam separantes."

\* Page 337.

† *Theology of Personality*, p. 146.



In endeavouring to interpret the distinction between "person" and "substance," I have ventured to apply the prepositions "ek" and "dia," which we have already recognized as playing so determinant a part in many of the Eastern Creeds; all going back to St. Paul's use of the terms in that classic passage, 1 Cor. viii. 6: "To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things . . . and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things. . . ." In this interpretation:

"(The) two elements or 'momenta' are indicated as respectively the  $\delta\iota\ \alpha\upsilon$  (instrumental cause) and the  $\epsilon\kappa\ \alpha\upsilon$  (source or ground) of consciousness, whether human or Divine. This . . . is a psychological and highly subjective interpretation of the Trinity as the Divine mode of existence. In the Godhead are included three 'egos' as sharing a common content of consciousness—three 'persons' in one 'substance.' . . .

"It is important to observe that in this (particular) interpretation of the Holy Trinity the concept of 'origination' plays no part; this particular line of interpretation is in nowise evolutionary. In the eternal Self-consciousness of God 'persons' and 'substance' are alike eternal, and no one of these elements is to be regarded as derived from any other. There is here no 'before' or 'after'; there is no 'greater' or 'less,' for the reason that all thought of 'origination' has been set aside. 'In hac trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil majus aut minus; sed totæ tres personæ coæternæ sibi sunt, et coæquales.' Thus the Trinity of Self-consciousness is distinguished from the Trinity of Origin."\*

It is significant as well as interesting to note the effort that was made to break away from the thought of "origination" as belonging exclusively to the prerogative of *the Father*. In a confession of faith dating apparently from the seventh century, both the Son and the Spirit are declared to be "Generator" and "Factor" ("Creator"): "Generator Pater, Generator Filius, Generator et Spiritus Sanctus, atque Sanctificator." But it is in Their mutual relations Each to the Other that One divine Person is acknowledged as "Generator," Another as "Genitus": "Secundum existentias (i.e., personas) Pater generator, Filius genitus, Spiritus Sanctus processio atque sanctificatio."†

It is a striking fact that in one of the ancient hymns appointed for Whit-Sunday (at Compline) the name "Pater" is applied to *the Holy Spirit*:

"Adsis, superne Spiritus,  
Pater benigne pauperum. . . ."

Or, as we have it in one of our hymns today (Hymn 378 in the collection in use in the American Church):

"Come, thou father of the poor,  
Come, thou source of all our store,  
Come, within our bosoms shine."

\* *Ibid.*, pp. 146, 147.

† Hahn, pp. 351, 352.



The recognition of the great Fact of God as the Three in One, and its expression in doctrinal form, indicates the spring-time of Western culture; in this great dogma we see the foundation-stone of intellectual discipline in the West. It would, perhaps, not be an exaggeration to say that here we may find the point of departure of that great movement of thought known as Scholasticism. The concept of three divine personal existences in the one divine and eternal nature is a paradox which was to prove an intellectual ferment, most provocative of thought, fascinating in its appeal both to imagination and to reason. And this thought was presently to find wide expression both in the life and work of the Church. Churches sprang up everywhere, dedicated in the Name of the "holy and undivided Trinity"; the doctrine was celebrated by a new festival in the Church year—the octave of Pentecost—which eventually came, in England and in Protestant Germany, to give its name to all succeeding Sundays throughout the year, until the return of the season of Advent; so that these are known as "Sundays after Trinity." Schools and colleges were dedicated in the same sacred Name. But the intellectual basis of all this movement is found in the Creeds and Confessions of the Western Church, to which we have referred, and most of all in that majestic Symbol known as the *Quicunque Vult*.

W. S. BISHOP.

(To be concluded.)

---

---

## RENN DICKSON HAMPDEN: MODERNIST (1793-1868)

### II

THERE are many features of outstanding interest presented by the Hampden Controversy. Historically it is important. It exhibited to the country for the first time the existence of the Tractarian party, while, by the very nature of the controversy, affording a justification for it. "The opposition to Hampden's appointment, baffled as it seemed, told on the country. The clergy of London and of the great provincial cities realized the existence of a cause and of a work at Oxford" (T. Mozley, *Reminiscences*, p. 387). "The most important year in the history of the Oxford Movement," writes Canon Liddon, "was the year 1836" (*Pusey*, i. 359). But it would be wrong to suppose that the opposition to the exponent of modern '*Rationalism*' was purely Tractarian in character. Men of all



parties combined against the Liberals. It was the Tractarian leaders, it is true, who sounded the tocsin of alarm and furnished the most valuable ammunition. But the Corpus Committee itself was of a thoroughly representative character. Its enemies were the last to deny the fact. "It may be observed," stated the *Liverpool Chronicle* (April 30, 1836), "that the six individuals who form the Corpus Committee, and whose names are attached to the various declarations, manifestos, etc., are the representatives of different classes and castes combined under the general head of what (for lack of a more appropriate term) we may call, with the *Edinburgh Review*, 'The Oxford Malignants.' Mr. [Vaughan] Thomas, for the ultrapolitical Magistratic clergy; Mr. Hill, of St. Edmund Hall, for the Saints; Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman for the Fanatics of all grades, the Apostolicals, and the young M.A.'s proselytized by them and brought up under their wing; Mr. Greswell for the men of *Theological Erudition*; and Mr. Sewell, for the namby-pambies, the gentlemen of sentimental religion, with whom the words 'painful,' 'awful,' 'dangerous,' are the watch-words." "This alliance," writes Canon Ollard (*Short History*, p. 53), "between the Tractarians and the Evangelicals against what would now be called the Broad Church school is to be remarked, for a few years later it would have been impossible. Indeed, a Protestant paper of the time the [*Watchman*] asserted that in Dr. Hampden's teaching 'Protestantism was stabbed to its very vitals.'"

On the other hand, it was from this time that the suspicion of Popery began to mount against the leaders of the Oxford Movement. To this a mischievous article by Wiseman in the *Dublin Review*, congratulating the Tractarians, with affected surprise, on their defence of orthodox Catholic doctrine, probably contributed.

The extent to which the controversy was characterized by personal abuse is quite remarkable. One illustration has already been cited. It was further pointed out that Mr. Vaughan Thomas "was a disappointed candidate for the Headship of Mary Hall, at the time of Dr. Hampden's election"; that he held three livings in three different dioceses of a total value of £991 per annum; and that he had brought a lawsuit against one of his patrons for the augmentation of his stipend. Newman was "a bigoted half-Jesuit, famous for his refusal to marry a conscientious Dissenter because she had not been baptized"; Pusey "the disappointed expectant of the theological chair." Dr. Cardwell, Principal of Alban Hall, was "a sinecure pluralist in the University, and a non-resident rector in Northamptonshire." Mr. Lancaster, of Queen's College, was alleged to have resigned the office of Public Examiner "from being unequal



to the performance of its duties"; Vaughan Thomas to have declined the office of Bampton Lecturer for the same reason. On the other side it was observed that of the two Proctors (Bayly of Pembroke and Reynolds of Jesus) who shielded Hampden by their veto in the Convocation of March 22, the Junior Proctor was a man for whose name, "as connected with any [academic] distinction, the Oxford Calendar is searched in vain; but, in lieu of this," he held a living in Hertfordshire, worth £290, of which the patron was the Whig Lord Holland. These personalities, however, are more frequent in the editorial or correspondence columns of the London and provincial Press than in the published pamphlets.

It remains to examine the nature of the controversy: but, as a preliminary measure, it is necessary to correct an all but universal misconception. Hampden's Bampton Lectures are almost invariably described by modern authors as "unreadable." This somewhat arbitrary judgment may probably be traced back to the *Reminiscences chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement* (published 1882) of the Rev. T. Mozley, who has a whole chapter entitled *The Unreadableness of the Bampton Lectures*, although there is really nothing relevant to this title in the text, beyond the implication that the lectures had in fact been read by very few. Elsewhere Mozley writes: "No one who knows what the mass of Oxford men are, and who will also take the trouble to read a few sentences in these lectures, can think it likely that they were either listened to or read. Perhaps they ought to have been listened to, and perhaps they ought to have been read, but the question is one of fact, and they were neither." Upon this slight foundation the tradition of their unreadableness appears to have been reared. "Hampden," writes F. Warre Cornish (*The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, i. 261), "had also the serious disadvantage of being unreadable." Canon Ollard (*Short History of the Oxford Movement*, p. 52) calls him "a very dry and dull divine," and adds: "The Lectures made little stir at the time, and probably no one now [1915] alive has ever read them through": and Mr. Sydney Dark (*Five Deans*, article on A. P. Stanley) follows Canon Ollard. But there is no hint of all this in Dean Church's *The Oxford Movement*, or (beyond the statement that the lectures "were not very animated compositions," and found few readers) in Liddon's *Life of Pusey*. In point of fact, these lectures, although obviously not widely read at the time, are eminently readable—certainly more readable than most contemporary publications of that character. Admittedly they are of unequal merit: two out of the eight lectures are heavy going. Admittedly, also, the author's thought is frequently



confused and ill-digested and obscure. But the style is dignified, effective, and occasionally epigrammatic, and the general observations, despite some passages of obscurity and of inconsistency, are frequently provocative and acute. It is difficult to make satisfactory citations apart from the general context, but these may serve :

"Origen, indeed, attributes the origin of all heresies in religion to the anxiety of inquisitive men to understand the doctrines of Christianity. Rather, they were owing to the undue solicitude of Christians to meet the objections of opponents. . . . When once the principle is recognized that a doctrine must be defended from all the consequences deducible from it, there is no extravagance of theory which the disputant may not be forced to adopt, for the sake of saving his original hypothesis" (pp. 119-120).

"The whole philosophy of the Schools on the subject of Divine Agency, let it be remembered, is founded on an application of processes in the mind to processes in nature" (p. 202).

"The close connection of Theological and Moral Truth has been of serious injury to both departments of human knowledge. . . . It must be admitted that no action, conformable to the Will of God, can, *as such*, in any case be productive of Evil. If we assume conformity to the Will of God as a definition of right, nothing evil can be *inferred* from it. But the logical consistency is not the point in question. The test of the theory is its adaptation to human nature. And its erroneousness is sufficiently shown by its tendency to mislead even the wish to do good. It is the mistake of acting upon an anticipated result out of our own power, when the very attainment of that result is a *consequence* of having acted *previously* according to the laws of our nature. Religion, in truth, begins where morality ends. Let each action be done as it is morally right. We are encouraged then to proceed, for we may be sure that it has the sanction of God . . . ." (pp. 264, 268-269).

"We are apt to speak of Religion as supplying fresh *motives* of conduct. But, in fact, the principles of our moral nature are the *motives*, the *only motives* to its action, as, to use an imperfect analogy, the springs and wheels of a machine are the motives to its action: and the truths of Christianity are presented to those principles as *objects* towards which they should tend. There is thus infinite room for addition to our actual moral improvement by the presentation of new and more glorious objects to our moral principles; whilst, at the same time, there is no addition of even a single *new* moral fact to the history of our internal nature. . . . Christianity, in fact, leaves Ethical Science, as such, precisely where it found it: all the duties which Ethical Science prescribes remain on their own footing; not altered or weakened, but affirmed and strengthened by the association of Religion" (pp. 300-301).

"The simple facts of Revelation must, by their nature, be open to objections, and, it may be said, to *unanswerable* objections; because these facts belong to an order of things of which we do not directly know the general laws. . . . Objections may be . . . futile against the bare revealed facts: but they cannot be decisively *proved* to be so; since the facts are not founded on any precise estimate of ideas involved in them: and in regard to these, therefore, objections may be suffered to stand without any detraction from our theology. The case, on the other hand, of a meta-



physical theology imperatively demands their solution. Is it, then, for a moment to be supposed that the simplicity of the Faith can be held where such a principle of theology is recognized? Is it not evident, rather, that the Faith, as it is in Christ, must be corrupted? The conclusions of human reason will naturally be intruded on the sacred truth. The fact will be accommodated to the theory: and exactness of theological definition will usurp the place of the plain dictates of the Holy Spirit" (pp. 366-367).

It may be added further that, so far from being out of date, these lectures are probably of more vital interest to-day than at the time of their delivery.

A general outline of Hampden's intellectual position at this time is to be found in Newman's Oxford novel, *Loss and Gain* (ch. ix.), in the sermon of "the Very Rev. Dr. Brownside, the new Dean of Nottingham, some time Huntingdonian Professor of Divinity." It will already have been inferred that the burden of the Bampton Lectures was an attack on theological tradition, or rather a plea for the recognition of the fact that its authority was purely secondary to that of Scripture truth. ("He that hath My word, let him speak My word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord."—Jer. xxiii. 28.) Their message may be summed up in four words: Back to the Bible! Hampden's case was good, although he overstated it. (Nor is it without significance that the last time that he figured prominently in the public eye was as the author of a *Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Hereford* [April, 1863], reassuring them against Colenso *On the Pentateuch*.) But to Newman, for whom throughout his life the authority of the Church was the only thing that stood between him and scepticism—as Manning was to fight for Papal Infallibility from the same motive—such an appeal was naturally repugnant. It was Hampden's purpose to examine "the effect of Opinion *as such* on the doctrines of Christianity," to "show how the intellect of man has insinuated its own conclusions in the course of its transmission, and modified the expressions by which the truth is conveyed" (p. 6), and to expose "the nature of that evil which Scholasticism embodies in it—the evil of a Logical Theology" (p. 54). "The only ancient, only catholic truth is the Scriptural fact" (p. 149). The authority of the Fathers is not impeccable, although their writings are of the utmost value as historical evidence (pp. 358-359). "In the Scripture itself"—not even excluding "the Apostolical Epistles"—"there are no *doctrines*. What we read there is matter of fact\*: either fact nakedly set forth as it occurred, or

\* In the introduction to the second edition of the Lectures (1837), Hampden expanded this somewhat baffling observation, and explained that he used the word "fact" in what he claimed to be its technical philosophical sense, thereby including "not merely such truths as our Lord's Birth, and Crucifixion, and Resurrection, and



fact explained and elucidated by the light of inspiration cast upon it" (p. 374). This does not mean that we should dispense with Articles and Creeds. "It appears to me that the occasion for Articles will probably never cease" (p. 380), for they are the fortifications—indispensable to man in his imperfect state—which defend for him "the saving, quickening truths of the Gospel" (p. 383). "At the same time, we must not suppose that the same immutability belongs to Articles of Religion, which we ascribe properly to Scripture-facts alone. As records of Opinions they are essentially variable. It is no impeachment of their truth to regard them as capable of improvement, of more perfect adaptation to the existing circumstances of the Church at different periods"\* (p. 383). The Creeds, in particular, merely employ the terms of contemporary theories of philosophy in order to exclude other theories "*more obviously* injurious to the simplicity of the Faith" (p. 378). They are, in fact, ancillary to Scripture truth: and it is essential to guard against the temptation "to identify the defence of the formularies" of a particular communion of Christians "with the defence of Christianity" (p. 382), for "to deny the essential variableness of such documents is to admit an human authority to a parity with the authority of Inspiration" (p. 381), and "to ascribe to Tradition the authority of Scripture, and to receive the Truth of Man with the deference due only to the Truth of God" (p. 352).

There is a real virtue in this line of argument, but there is also a real danger. For it lends force to the wretched parrot-cry with which so many modern preachers have made us all distressingly familiar, that "Religion is not Theology." After all, though the authority of human tradition is patently inferior to that of divine revelation, it may be a safer guide than contemporary sentimentalism: and circumstances are constantly recurring which justify the dictum of Mr. T. S. Eliot—"The spirit killeth, but the letter giveth life." Indeed, almost any coherent system of theology is preferable to the looseness of modern ethical humanitarianism as an aid to the interpretation of the Gospel. There may be—to borrow Hampden's phraseology—another mystery attached to the plain facts of Scripture, besides the mystery of traditional theology, which is still more clearly

---

Ascension, and the Miracles which He wrought, and the Descent of the Holy Ghost, or the Call of Abraham, and the Thunders of Sinai, and the Dedication of the Temple," but also "the Divinity of our Lord, His Consubstantiality with the Father and the Holy Spirit, His Atonement, His Mediation, His distinct Personality, His perpetual presence with His Church, His future Advent to judge the world, the Communion of Saints, the Corruption of our Nature, the Efficacy of Divine Grace, the Acceptableness of Works wrought through Faith, the Necessity of Repentance" (pp. 24-25).

\* "As to the difficulty and hazard of any actual alteration, I have nothing to say. I do not presume to say that alteration is actually required. I am merely addressing myself to the general question . . ." (p. 381).



"not a mystery of God" (p. 146). Again, this teaching seems to be reflected in one of the fundamental weaknesses of public-school religion: the assumption that the only type of sermon suitable for a School Chapel is a sermon on Christian Ethics—with which boys already possess an adequate acquaintance, and in which, therefore, it is difficult to interest them; and which, in addition, are for the most part not peculiar to Christianity—and not a sermon on Christian Theology, which is both peculiarly Christian and extremely unfamiliar, and which, if plainly and competently handled, invariably holds the attention even of those who cannot wholly understand its drift. But these consequences, although naturally and almost inevitably proceeding from the disparagement of tradition, cannot be legitimately deduced from this particular attack upon it. For Hampden—and this is the real virtue of his lectures—was concerned primarily to exhibit, not the worthlessness of tradition, but the superiority to human tradition of Scriptural revelation. Tradition, being of human origin, is fallible: the Bible, being divinely inspired, is a certain guide in matters of faith and morals. He rightly saw that the very foundation of Anglican piety is its insistence on a Biblical discipline. This is the real safeguard of the Faith: and it defends it from the excesses of sentiment no less than from the errors of tradition or from the weaknesses inherent in any system of philosophy\* appended to it. Human authority—whether the unanimous agreement of the Church, the dogmatic infallibility of the Pope, or the speculative system of Aquinas—is prone to error: to stake one's faith upon it is to court disaster: the only impregnable defence of the revelation contained in Holy Scripture against the assaults of scepticism and infidelity is itself. The very vehemence of Newman's indignation attested the value, and even the necessity, of Hampden's insistence on this point. Philosophy, moreover, regarded as an ally of Christianity, is an ally of dubious necessity and doubtful loyalty: and even Oxford theologians may yet come to admit that it is at least arguable that the purely human values of "Beauty, Truth, and Goodness" are not merely irrelevant to the Gospel, but positively inimical to it.

It was over this question of the value of tradition that the controversy raged. But what is indeed astonishing is that Hampden's opponents—and, *ipso facto*, his defenders—ignored almost entirely the one lecture which is bound to strike the modern reader as infinitely the most controversial—namely, the lecture (No. VII.) on *The Sacraments*. For this lecture is astonish-

\* Was it not Bishop Thirlwall who said that the fault of the doctrine of Transubstantiation was not that it was bad philosophy, but that it was philosophy? And c. John Wesley's famous rebuke to William Law (*Works*, vol. ix., p. 445).



ingly modern—unless, indeed, we may infer that Modernism is astonishingly reactionary—a mere rehash of certain propositions which the Church of England a century ago regarded as either commonplace or insignificant, but which it has since, in its mature wisdom, come definitively to reject both as untenable in the light of history and as subversive of the Faith. The extreme modernity of Hampden's opinions regarding the Eucharist may be most conveniently illustrated by comparing them with those of a Modern Churchman:\*

DR. HAMPDEN (1832)

"It appears that the simplicity of Scripture truth has been altogether abandoned [by the Schoolmen], in the endeavour to raise up, on the solemn ordinances appointed by our Lord, for the edification, and charity, and comfort of His Church, an elaborate artificial system of mystical theurgy. . . . Contemplate our Saviour at the Last Supper, breaking bread, and giving thanks, and distributing to His disciples; and how great is the transition from the institution itself to the splendid ceremonial of the Latin Church? . . . Thanks to the Christian resolution of our Reformers, they broke that charm which the mystical number of the Sacraments carried with it, and dispelled the theurgic system which it supported" (pp. 341, 342).

"[The mediæval sacramental doctrine] is clearly not *absurd*, if, by that expression, we mean its inconsistency with reason. It is, on the contrary, perfectly consistent with reason, if we grant the hypothesis in philosophy on which it is founded. And, even in those hypotheses themselves, there is nothing intrinsically absurd. We can only say, with our present light in physical science, that they are unphilosophical and untrue" (pp. 338-339).

"Rightly, then, to understand the doctrine of the Sacraments in general, we must look to the theory of secret

BISHOP BARNES (1925)

"There is little sacramental teaching in the New Testament. What there is in the Gospels has the purest spiritual character. . . . How different is this from the ideas which entered Catholicism from the mystery-faiths and made the Catholic sacramental doctrine which our Church repudiated at the Reformation. . . . The Christian Church soon entered an atmosphere vastly different from that of the New Testament. . . . Religion has been contaminated by magic; the spiritual has been degraded to the mechanical."—*Catholicism and Christianity: a Sermon preached in Westminster Abbey, June 14, 1925*, pp. 205, 206.

"[Since the Renaissance and the Reformation] the scientific spirit, which is the natural foe of magic, has dominated educated thought. Unless that spirit decays and a new era of intellectual barbarism overtakes us, Christianity as corrupted by the pagan mystery superstitions has no future. . . ."—*Ibid.*, p. 207.

"How are we to account for the rapid growth of sacramental worship, and of magical ideas associated

\* The page references are to *Should Such a Faith Offend? Sermons and Addresses*, by the Bishop of Birmingham (1927).



influences on which it is based, the mysterious power, conceived to belong to certain things, or actions, or persons, of effecting changes not cognizable by the senses, and changes as real as those apparent to observation. . . . The general belief in Magic, in the early ages of the Church, may sufficiently account for the ready reception of such a theory of sacramental influence. The maxim of Augustine, *Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit Sacramentum*, appears to be, in fact, an adaptation of the popular belief respecting the power of incantations and charms to the subject of Religion" (p. 315).

with the consecrated elements, in the Church during the first three centuries? The answer is given by modern investigation of the religious environment in which early Christianity was shaped. Until comparatively recently accurate knowledge of contemporary paganism was scanty. . . . But modern research has made it clear that, when Christianity began to spread, religious enthusiasm and devotion in the Græco-Roman world were mainly associated with the mystery religions. . . . The defect of all these cults was that their sacramentalism was essentially unethical. . . . The Sacraments, in fact, worked mechanically *ex opere operato*: in other words, they were magical."—*The Eucharist: an Address to the Modern Churchman's Conference at Oxford, August, 1925*; pp. 214-215.

It would, of course, be ludicrous on the ground of these and similar parallels to accuse Dr. Barnes of plagiarism from Hampden's Bampton Lectures, nor is that imputation intended for one moment to be conveyed. But it is important to note that, in this context, Dr. Barnes is regarded by his admirers as a man in advance of his time, whereas, in the same context, Dr. Hampden, pronouncing almost identical opinions a century ago, was regarded by his opponents as a man in line with contemporary thought. For, throughout the controversy, his sacramental theories were allowed to go almost by default. It is true that Pusey had unearthed them from the published Lectures in January, 1836 (*Pusey*, i. 367), and that extracts from Lecture VII. were included among other alleged heretical propositions in Newman's *Elucidations* and in Pusey's *Dr. Hampden's Statements and the XXXIX Articles compared*: but no particular emphasis was attached to them, nor did Archdeacon Hare, in his *Letter to the Dean of Chichester* (1848)—perhaps the most important pamphlet in defence of Hampden in either controversy—do more than glance at them in passing. When did the change occur? In 1850 Alexander Beresford Hope was writing: "Leave the Church of England quiet, and another generation will grow up which will believe in sacramental grace. Some will secede in the interim, but this new generation may, if we live on in patience and in confidence, redeem the English



Church." In 1872 there came, for better or for worse, the Bennett Judgment, which legitimized even the excesses of the contemporaneous revolution in sacramental thought. Herein, therefore, for those who are the heirs of that revolution, lies the real interest of the Hampden Controversy, a controversy interesting for what was attacked, but far more interesting for what was not attacked. Herein also lies a question which the conscientious Modern Churchman is compelled to face: Is the Bishop of Birmingham a man born a hundred years too early, or a man born a hundred years too late? Who are the prophets of Progress? and who the standard-bearers of Reaction?

C. H. SMYTH.

### THE METHOD OF THE CATECHISM

IN a book published in 1896 under the title of *The Clergy and the Catechism*, the sub-title appears, "being an attempt to adapt the Methode de St. Sulpice as expounded by Mgr. Dupanloup to the ways and wants of the English Church." That this and similar attempts were in a large measure successful need not be called in question: history will have to record that the Methode as expounded by Dupanloup in his famous lectures was in many places most excellently adapted to existing circumstances and needs. But the ways and wants of the English Church have changed very considerably during the last thirty years, and the question arises as to whether, at this point in the development of the problem of religious education, the time has not arrived when a reconsideration of the adaptability of the Method should be attempted. There are many who would immediately reply that the Method is entirely obsolete and must be definitely abandoned as an educational instrument: on the other hand, there are still a few to whom the Method in all its original purity is sacrosanct. We may doubt whether either of these extreme views is correct: at least, we may examine the question.

The difficulty at once arises as to how to approach the problem. In very few parishes indeed is the Method quite strictly followed. If this were the case it might not be hard to point at once to obsolete features and maladaptations. What may be found in the parishes which claim to practise the Method is a multitude of variations. These variations have not arisen from uniform causes and motives. Here and there the variations from the original model given by Dupanloup have been due to an attempt to bring the Method into line with more recent educational ideas: these are likely to prove to be the most



suggestive and helpful cases. But in very many more instances the variations are due to sheer ignorance of the technique of the Method: these cases are more likely to cause despair than useful suggestion. In some places what has happened has been that a children's service has been decked with the name and superficial semblance of the Catechism, whilst essentially remaining neither better nor worse than it was before.

It will best serve our purpose to begin by recalling the chief merits claimed by enthusiasts for the Method: we may thus be led to discover which are the permanent, which the ephemeral, and which the spurious advantages; in other words, which are the values to be retained and what may be discarded.

(i.) The proceedings take place in church. Here we have at once the gain of a worshipful and prayerful atmosphere: we have an association of the learning of the Faith with the place and practice of worship. We have, furthermore, a setting quite favourable to the attempt to teach a large number of children together, a setting which suggests, though not inevitably so, the Parish Priest as teacher.

(ii.) The usual programme, so it is claimed, is technically correct. The essential part of the Method is the rigorous maintenance in unvarying order of the three Principal Exercises—the Questioning, the Instruction, the Homily. These three exercises—so runs the claim—are rightly directed in turn to the memory, the intellect, and the will. The children are certain to be faithful in the preparation of the memory work, because all in turn will be questioned by name. The strict form of questioning, with the question repeated in the answer, will ensure precision and accuracy: what is so learned will be remembered. Other merits of the conventional order belonging to the three subsidiary exercises—the Prayers, the Hymns, the Admonition—need not delay us; all may be briefly comprehended in the single word precision.

(iii.) The taking down of the dictated summary ensures, it is alleged, that every child will take away a certain deposit of holy wisdom, and the working out of the analysis during the week will enhance this gain.

(iv.) The Method enables children of different social grades to be brought together in a way which is eminently desirable and otherwise often exceedingly difficult.

Probably additions to this brief catalogue of merits will occur to many, but in most cases they will be found to arise out of these four, to which, for the sake of brevity, we may confine ourselves. What is to be our estimate of these claims? My own estimate of them would be, stated concisely, as follows: (i.) and (iv.) I should regard as permanent and important;



(ii.) will, I think, have to be regarded definitely as spurious; and (iii.) is ephemeral in the sense that the co-operation of the children at which it aims will have to be gained in much more varied ways.

Before attempting a justification of this estimate or attempting any constructive criticism, it will be necessary to enquire what place, assuming that there may often be such a place, can be taken by the Method of the Catechism in a revised form in the educational system of a well-ordered parish. It is unfortunate that in the past there has often appeared to be a disposition to contrast the Method of the Catechism with that of the Sunday School and Bible Class in such a way as to suggest that the former is the only method of teaching compatible with any definiteness of doctrinal aim, the latter being inevitably attended with a certain vagueness and uncertainty. But such a contrast is quite unreal, and it is a matter of accident, and not of inherent necessity, that, to a certain extent, the alternative between Sunday School and Catechism has appeared to correspond with shades of doctrinal point of view. We are here concerned with a Method, and not with the doctrine to be taught by the Method: if the Catechism is a good method it may as well be employed to teach one theology as another. In this connection it is interesting to note that by Dupanloup the Catechism was meant to be preceded by what we should call a Sunday School. Probably we shall be right in coming to the conclusion that the Method, revised and adapted, may be a useful one to employ as part of the whole scheme of organization in any parish, and that, on the other hand, the class and school methods are more suited to do part of the work in the same parish. But before we can reach this conclusion we have first to determine whether the Catechism can be so adapted as to be a good method at all for any part of the work. The test is a simple one to state, and it is this: Can teaching be given by this Method in such a way that it will be truly known, which is to say apprehended and loved, and consequently lived? Regarding the matter in this light, we may go back to the traditional method of the Catechism and review it afresh. Will it bear such scrutiny? If it will not, does it mean that the Method must be discarded, with all its merits, or can it be revised in such a way as to furnish us with a really reliable educational method for some purposes in some parishes?

We may confine our attention chiefly to the instructional part of the Catechism, to the three Principal Exercises enumerated above, and familiar to all Catechists: the question of the subsidiary exercises and the paraphernalia of the Method are of secondary importance.



Our first point will be to call in question the rigid division of the instructional element into three parts, based, as it appears to be, on an entirely obsolete psychology. It is an entire misconception which isolates the supposed "faculty" of memory from other intellectual processes, and intellectual processes from the process of the "will": anyone familiar with the principles of modern psychology will at once recognize the error which is here discovered. This is the difficulty about the first Principal Exercise of the Method. In so far as the questioning is a pure attempt at teaching by memorization in isolation it stands condemned beyond all hope of reprieve. There is a real place for memorization in modern education, but its place, on the right occasions of its use, is after, and not before, explanation and analysis. True it is that the questioning is very often, nowadays, preliminary questioning leading onward, either by recall of what has gone before or by anticipation of what follows, to the coming lesson. In this case it is soundly used, serving as a point of contact for the new material for thought: but it is still a mistake, usually, to separate it off by one of the subsidiary exercises from the main lesson.

We come, therefore, to consider the Instruction, or second Principal Exercise. The main fault of the old type of Catechism lesson, still used by a large number of Catechists and earnestly defended, is that it is deductive in method and not inductive: it starts with a proposition and "explains" it, instead of starting with a problem and solving it: it begins just where it should end. It is further at fault inasmuch as it is usually wholly didactic in method; its "illustrations" are not aids to thought, but devices for rendering thought unnecessary. It should proceed along lines of "research" and exploration: the scholars otherwise are so occupied in being taught that they fail to learn.

We come now to the question of the Homily, the third Principal Exercise of the present arrangement. Here the peril lies in drawing the moral instead of letting the lesson do its own work. Sound psychology suggests that if a lesson has proceeded along right lines, the emotional attitude of the children towards what has been properly presented should be assumed to be correct and must work itself out. What has formerly been thought of as an appeal to the will is really an attempt to separate the conative element of the mental process involved in the whole lesson. A Catechist equipped with a sound knowledge of psychology would probably never use the old-fashioned homily: all that he hopes to contribute through it should already have been embodied in the main lesson. On occasion he might frankly substitute for this lesson an address, as, for example, in preparation for Communion. He would often conclude the



lesson with a relevant story without further comment. He would more often still give the children a question to write about. Still more often he would lead them in expressive prayer and worship. At times he might invite them to end the lesson themselves by reading silently some relevant passage of Scripture, which could then be solemnly read as the Gospel is now read in the usual order of proceedings. One of the most difficult things to provide for in the Catechism is the co-operation of the children in the actual lesson: discussion and research, and still more individual work, are very hard to provide for, and yet all are most important. Possibly one partial solution is to set such work for weekday activity instead of the more formal analysis. The change to a more inductive type of teaching would inevitably lead to a modification of the old manner of note-giving and note-taking. Dictated summaries would be much rarer: the use of a blackboard and other apparatus would often occur.

It will be obvious by now that the conclusion to which we are tending is twofold. First, that there is a need in the interests of sound educational method entirely to reconsider the old three Principal Exercises; and, secondly, that instead of the instruction element in the programme being divided into three separated sections it should remain a unity. The old three Principal Exercises therefore become one. At the same time we must at this point make a further criticism of the former classification. It is true that the Catechism is not primarily an act of liturgical worship, but the prayers of the Catechism are a much more important part of the whole than their relegation to the subsidiary exercises would suggest. Again, the opening of the session with a section made of what are considered to be two of the subsidiary exercises—viz., a hymn and prayers—is apt to reduce these to something too much like a formality. There is a real need of a definite act of Recollection and Invocation of the Holy Spirit as a very solemn approach to the weighty matter of learning. We might therefore suggest that the three Principal Exercises should now be considered to be:

- (i.) The Recollection and Invocation.
- (ii.) The Instruction.
- (iii.) The Reading (of the Gospel or other passage) and the Prayers.

The enumeration of subsidiary exercises might now be suffered to lapse, the use of hymns and the giving out of notices (*i.e.*, the Admonition) being left to the discretion of the Catechist and merely indicated in suggested programmes.



On this basis we might proceed to suggest a new normal order of the Catechism as follows:

- A. 1. First Principal Exercise: Recollection and Invocation.  
2. Hymn.
- B. 3. The Instruction, including often the writing of an exercise.  
4. Hymn.
- C. 5. The Gospel with Responses.  
6. The Prayers, which would include Creed and Litany or some form of Intercessions.  
7. The Notices.

A word may suffice for present purposes to deal with the question of what we have called "paraphernalia." The pre-arranged system of seating can be advisedly retained, although its original purpose for an elaborate method of questioning has ceased. Monitors for each row in charge of the marking of attendance cards and care of writing material will be employed, but the monitors will be given a more dignified status than hitherto and new responsibilities.

Visualizing some such revision of the Method, what "needs and wants of the Church of England" might it claim to fulfil? It will surely be agreed that the Method is not one which can be used with any prospect of success with children of less than eleven years of age. The Lesser Catechism is a title which some may wish to retain, but it seems certain that the class teaching of the Sunday School is far more suitable for children who cannot handle books and writing material with considerable ease. It was pointed out in a previous article in *THEOLOGY* that the provision of adequate senior departments for religious instruction will be needed for children who, under the new proposals for reorganization of the day-schools, will in future be educated from 11+ to 15 in senior schools of a secondary type. The Method of the Catechism revised on sound lines might furnish a most useful instrument for this purpose in very many parishes where the difficulty of finding teachers of sufficient knowledge to deal with these senior scholars is acute. The Dupanloup system also contemplates Catechisms of perseverance for older scholars, and it is possible that still further adaptations of the Method might make it a serviceable way of providing for the older adolescents. An alternative to the revised Method of the Catechism is that of the Fellowship, which has been employed successfully in many parishes. A good description of this Method, which is applicable to young adolescents, and probably definitely preferable for older adolescents, will be found in a paper by J. B. Currie, published by the Church of England



Sunday School Institute. In conclusion, reference may also be made to a paper by Canon Bater in the same series on "A Middle School on Catechism Lines," which contains interesting suggestions for a department of senior children taught in school, but mainly by one teacher, using the methods of the Catechist.

A. R. BROWNE-WILKINSON.

---

## LESSONS FROM THE CHURCH IN FRANCE \*

### II

"Nous devons faire une France propre" ("We have got to make a clean France"). I remember reading this placard upon a notice board in a French church not long after the war. Probably there is no country in Europe where the production of indecent literature is worse and more tolerated by a lax public opinion than in France. And, indeed, it is strange that French law spends more time in attacking Catholic publications than indecent publications. It is so easy to buy indecent postcards at a Paris kiosk, but almost impossible to buy *La Croix*, the Catholic daily paper. Here is a state of things which I am glad to say public opinion would never tolerate over here. The Church is the one body in France which has made efforts, despite enormous difficulties, to set up a high moral standard among the people and attempted to raise public opinion. We must clean up France, said the notice I have just mentioned, which incidentally referred to a campaign against indecent literature. Not long ago a brave little priest caused somewhat of a sensation in burning filthy literature he found for sale at bookstalls and kiosks in Paris, and he was prosecuted in the police court. He drew attention to a very crying scandal. But the greatest service that the clergy have done for the French nation in the realm of morals is the high standard they have set in opposing the destruction of the French nation through the spread of birth prevention. For a long while in the last century France was the only country where this vice was at all widespread as a social sin, though its practice has more recently spread to other countries, including unhappily our own. The French clergy have made a stand for as high a standard of morality in this respect as our own clergy have in the matter of divorce.

What, in brief, is the real crux of the matter of this? The Catholic Church is the guardian of the family. The Catholic

\* A paper read in substance before an Anglo-Catholic gathering in Nottingham in January, 1929.



Church is bound to uphold the principles of the Christian family against all who would seek to destroy family life, whether it be the State or the individual. The Church in France has, indeed, set a very high standard of morality in this respect, but it is a standard full of Christian charity and sympathy. So great was the decline in the population of France at one time that even the anti-clericals began to get alarmed, and there actually arose a school of thought known as the Maximalist school that would reward any birth that took place, even though it be illegitimate. To such a desperate pass had France come. Few countries have so many foreign workmen, Belgians and Italians pouring across her frontiers, because there are not enough of her own people to do the work. Yet births cannot be manufactured by rewards. It would be quite useless to bring human beings, like robots, into the world to work French factories. Human beings must be treated as human beings, and can only be brought up by means of the family.

Every year there takes place at some French town a conference upon some social problem from the Catholic aspect. These are known as *Semaines sociales*, or social weeks; they correspond to the Anglo-Catholic summer schools of sociology, or to the various conferences arising out of COPEC. In 1923 at Grenoble the depopulation menace was the subject of discussion, and the published reports of the conference make most interesting reading. There were a vast number of speakers and the subject was treated most sympathetically. The idea that Catholics are necessarily pledged to produce numbers of children indiscriminately was warmly refuted by that great educationist, Monseigneur Julien, Bishop of Arras. "One of the reasons," he said, "for the restriction of families is the difficulty that families of modest means have of giving their children an adequate education. A weakness, someone will say, but an honourable weakness, which has as its aim a praiseworthy ideal, that of bringing up the son to be as good as his father. Don't let us grumble at this too much. It is by such means that the movement towards social betterment works. Where, then, could the State place its educational scholarships better to promote the intellectual advancement of the people than in awarding them to large families, who, for the very reason that they are large, deserve well of their country?"

I cannot help feeling myself that this is a subject upon which Anglo-Catholic clergy might be more outspoken, though with many of our post-war difficulties, such as the rise in the cost of living, taxation, shortage of servants, and shortage of adequate houses, it must be treated with the greatest sympathy and not by mere denunciation. It is, indeed, a subject with which I



should like to see a future Anglo-Catholic Congress or School of Sociology deal. To my mind this is a problem as clearly connected with the sanctity of the Sacrament of Marriage as the divorce question; indeed, the two really go very closely together, as most lawyers would agree that divorce is generally commonest in families with no or few children.

But I repeat again that the Church in France does not advocate parentage of large families as a passport to heaven, without making conditions which allow large families to exist. I have quoted the Bishop of Arras' plea for bursaries for large families, but the Church is keenly interested in conditions which make for social justice, adequate wages, and proper housing. It does not take the side of masters or men, but seeks to find a way between. Surely the rôle of the clergy should be upon the lines of our Blessed Lord's beatitude, "Blessed are the peacemakers." And it is that great Catholic writer on the social problem, M. Georges Goyau, who has some very pertinent words upon this subject. And with this beatitude he couples the other, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." This, says M. Georges Goyau, is our Lord's interpretation of the beatitude: "I am come to teach men what is the thing most to be desired here. It is not the riches which the strong can take; it is not the soil which the strong can appropriate; it is not even physical energy which the strong can subdue; it is souls. I was the Redeemer of souls. But it is to the meek and to them alone that I have given the privilege of gaining souls." And that is the motto of the French priest, to win souls, the evangelical motto, without which it will be impossible to make peace.

A typical example of the ability to make peace between two factions of masters and men was given a few years ago in the little industrial town of Audincourt in the south-east near Belfort, a curious little place because, being a fief of the Duke of Wurtemberg until the time of Napoleon, it was compulsorily Protestant, and today the Catholics of the town are mainly the working classes who have come in of more recent years. There is also a Communist element, and the mayor is a Communist. In 1921 a strike broke out at the Peugeot motor works, where the directors were Protestant and the workmen largely under Communist influence. The priest in this town was a certain Monsieur Jacquot, a very determined person where the rights of the Church were concerned. Twice he had appeared in the police court. In one case damages were awarded against him because he refused to give Christian burial to an atheist, and upon the other occasion he won the case on appeal; the Communistic mayor had forbidden him to hold an outdoor procession, and when he defied the order the mayor took him



into court. At once he offered his services to try to bring the strike to a conclusion, and the remarkable thing appears to be that both sides, the Protestant masters and the Communistic strikers, appear to have given him their confidence. He was able to influence the men to return to work and he was also able to induce the masters not to take vindictive measures against them. Perhaps what strikes most readers of the little book which he published, describing what he did, is the sound principles he applied to the affair. I think it is a pity myself when priests takes political sides, either Conservative or Labour; the Abbé Jacquot settled the thing by Christian principles and common sense. When a workman said to him, "Christ said that men must forgive their enemies; you forgive in the confessional. Why don't they forgive us?" he replied, "Allow me, dear friends to give you a little lesson in theology. That's what you lack. For instance, you have just confessed to have done some wrong to a third party, taken away his reputation or his purse. In acknowledging the wrong, he tells me of the matter as he would tell a magistrate. That is Confession. Do I absolve him at once? No, that would be too easy; it is necessary that he undertake to repair the injustice in re-establishing the person's reputation or restoring the purse, and he must repent sincerely. That is essential and is called contrition. He must accept a salutary penance which will be a reparation for his breaking of the law, and which will prevent him from doing it again. My friends, all that is necessary in the confessional to receive Absolution. But you are a long way off that where M. Peugeot is concerned. Not only have you not repented, but you scarcely recognize that you are in the wrong. If you were determined not to do it again, he would perhaps be glad enough to reinstate you."

Certainly, M. Jacquot's ideas as to the social system are based upon sound Catholic theology. I think that all Christian Socialists would do well to get their theology right, as the French do. It is no good merely being on the side of the angels, talking vaguely of the evil of the slums and of low wages and of not quite knowing what to do. To deal with the social problem at all adequately the theology of Christian Socialism should be studied; what I mean is the Christian attitude about capital, about wages, about property, about the rights of the State against individuals, and all those things that are connected. The Church in France has acted with wonderful courage in its attempt to set up Christian Trades Unions. The Cardinal Archbishop of Lyons was the initiator of these most useful organizations. It was not easy to start them, as for one thing they were a kind of *via media* which is really more suited to the English than the French



outlook. The principles are to avoid strikes and force, and to encourage mutual understanding, charity, and co-operation. The unions naturally distrust them and call them the tools of the masters, while the masters are inclined to be afraid. But we can be quite sure that they move upon the right lines.

Another feature of the Catholic social activities of the French Church are the so-called social weeks, of which I have mentioned one already in connection with the population problem. These social weeks are truly admirable, and it is worth noting that the first was held in 1904, when the anti-clerical persecution was at its height. The first held after the War was at Metz in 1919, when the subject for discussion was Catholicism in its Social Aspect. At Le Havre in 1926 the subject was International Peace, and in 1927 the week at Nancy was given to an extremely up-to-date topic, The Place of Woman in Society. I suppose that our Anglo-Catholic schools of sociology somewhat correspond to these social weeks, and certainly Anglo-Catholics should do all they can to study the different social problems from a Catholic aspect. The weeks might also be compared to COPEC, though it has always seemed to me that, excellent as the idea of COPEC was, it attempted to do far too much in one week.

We have seen the work of the Catholic Church in France in education and in its dealings with the social problem; there is one other aspect to which I should like to devote a few moments, and that is literature. We hear a constant lament that we cannot produce an Anglo-Catholic novelist; when we have such a brilliant author in our ranks as Miss Sheila Kaye-Smith that seems hardly fair. On March 31 there closes a competition arranged by a well-known publishing house, Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, for which a most generous prize is being offered for the best religious novel. I sincerely hope that it will be won by an Anglo-Catholic, and I see no reason why it should not be. But to my mind we want something more than novelists. We want an Anglo-Catholic Francis Thompson. We want poets, we want journalists (and I can speak from my own personal experience that we want competent young Catholic journalists very badly indeed), we want philosophers and thinkers, we want historians. Theologians we appear to have plenty of. But, oh, that we could produce either a Psichari or a Péguy! The one great work of Psichari, *The Centurion's Journey*, can be reckoned the finest mystical writing of this century, and, this is the remarkable thing, it is from the pen of the grandson of the cynic and unbeliever, Ernest Renan. A young man said in my hearing not long ago, apropos of Christianity, "Oh, that's all played out long ago." Renan said that in 1870, and his grandson, Ernest Psichari, found God as a



soldier in the African desert, became a Dominican tertiary, and would have taken Holy Orders had not the War cut short his brilliant career at the age of thirty. But before he departed for the Front he left behind with a priest friend a marvellous manuscript which first saw the light in 1915. *The Centurion's Journey* is a great poem in prose telling of his struggles with sin and unbelief until he finds relief in Jesus Christ and in the Catholic Church. It is fit to rank with the *Hound of Heaven* as the story of a great spiritual experience. And there is Charles Péguy, Psichari's friend, who too made the supreme sacrifice in 1914 and left us with those great epic poems concerning St. Joan of Arc, really his own spiritual struggles—Péguy, who never formally submitted to the Church, though his culture and thought are Catholic through and through. It will be a great day for us English Catholics when we produce a work of mystical genius upon such lines.

Perhaps, however, it might be useful to say a little of the Catholic novelists. I would mention two: Bazin, who is popular and who is really well known in England, as so many of his books have been translated; and Bourget, the deep thinker with his profound psychological knowledge. Bazin has a knack of being able to deal with the problems of the age—divorce, the anti-clerical laws, the religious life—in a thoroughly practical and popular way, the great charm of his style making him appeal to non-Catholic readers. Bourget is quite different. He is not in the least popular, but he is one of the profoundest students of character among any European novelists, though many English people do not like him, as he does not tell a story well and relies wholly on character drawing. He is always scrupulously fair to the anti-clerical, but he aims as a rule to show that the lay ideal is largely difficult, if not impossible, to achieve without the means of grace. Many anti-clericals are not bad men; they have ideals, but are not able to carry them out without the sacraments. M. Bourget also attacks vigorously the cult of the intellect without character.

France, though it has no official "Catholic" party, as have many European countries, has nevertheless a daily paper that is definitely Catholic, *La Croix*, which is under the control of the Assumptionist Fathers. It is difficult to obtain in Paris at an ordinary bookstall, as it is largely boycotted, but it claims, and probably not without reason, that it finds its way into every country rectory in France, and the faithful are constantly urged to subscribe to it by the Bishops as well as to buy the other publications of *La Bonne Presse*. At the same time, it is not altogether popular among the Catholics of the towns, as it is considered unnecessarily conservative and opposed to a reason-



able amount of social progress. It would seem a pity that France cannot really run to another Church paper of more tolerant views. Nevertheless, it is loyally supported by Church-people; I do not know its precise circulation, but it certainly runs into several hundred thousands.

Besides the *Croix* there are other Catholic newspapers such as the *Nouvelles Religieuses*, which is very much an official publication. It comes out twice monthly, and, containing Vatican decrees and other announcements, would not make a great appeal to the ordinary layman. There are also provincial Catholic newspapers, such as the *Ouest-Eclair* and the various provincial papers known as the *Croix* of some particular region.

But there is also a rather remarkable press bureau known as the *Action Populaire*, founded at Rheims in 1903. Its buildings were completely destroyed in the War and its work suspended, but the late Pope Benedict XV. was so keen on the work that he sent a donation to restart it within a few weeks of the Armistice. It is closely connected with the Christian Trades Union Movement. Its programme is described as "consisting in cessation from social strife, mutual respect for justice and charity according to Christian principles." To accomplish these ends people must be educated up to them. It publishes two papers, the *Peuple de France* and the *Revue Verte*, as well as a number of books. It would be difficult to mention any Anglican organization to correspond exactly with the *Action Populaire*, though the Labour Party's Research Department does a similar work in the sphere of politics. It is non-party.

I have given in this paper a few notes about the French Church, indicating where I think we English people have something to learn. May I end with an appeal? May I ask both priests and laity not to spend a fortnight in France this summer and come back trying to imitate the corrupt following of the French in the matter of the ritual and adornment of our churches? I understand little of ritual, but what I have seen in France is often slovenly, sometimes ludicrous, and seldom indeed worthy of imitation. We English have a supreme virtue which God has implanted in us, and let us beware of belittling a divine gift; that virtue is good taste. We can set an example of ritual and decoration from which continental peoples may well learn. I am told that some years ago the Pope sent over a commission to study the plain-song as sung in the Church of the Cowley Fathers at Oxford, truly a great compliment to the English Church. We gain no respect from our French friends if we imitate their vices. An American reviewer of my book on the French Church did indeed liken me to Dr. Percy Dearmer. I hasten to disassociate myself



from such a compliment. I do not think we need to turn every Catholic church in England into a St. Mary's, Primrose Hill. But we can make our churches both churches of devotion and churches of the best English taste, an example to the world of what the Catholic Church really means. It is in other ways along the lines I have indicated that we can learn from France.

C. H. PALMER.

## AN INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF AUTHORITY\*

### II

#### IV. RATIONAL AUTHORITY AND THE TEACHING CHURCH

STUDENTS of the Old Testament know that the word prophet underwent a complete change of meaning. Originally it meant a person who became ecstatic and behaved abnormally: the main symptom of his prophetic character was that he appeared to be under influences which were not those of a normal rational consciousness. But the people to whom we ordinarily refer as "The Prophets" were the exact reverse of this. They were as a body singularly well-balanced persons, and presented their message regularly in a rational form. They did not normally claim supernatural visions and auditions, and the few such abnormal revelations which they do claim to have enjoyed, like Isaiah's vision at his call, were only revelations of events (the worship of heaven, and so on), apart from the private and individual instructions given to the prophet himself. Even if we add the mystical visions of Zechariah (the imagery of which is, however, probably derived from the prophet's own mind), their reference again is to particular matters; and, further, they require considerable reflection for their elucidation. It appears to me quite true to say that the prophets arrived at the great truths, both of doctrine and of providential ordering which they taught, by a process of inspired reflection, and that their real authority was the enlightened reason of competent holy men, representative of the competent rational powers of mankind, in tune and communion with the mind of God. By reason, it hardly seems necessary to say, I do not mean mere logic, but a rational appreciation in which both imaginative and critical elements play their part.

It was suggested previously that the authority of the Christian Church is really of the same character. This is the alter-

\* Mr. Prestige's previous article on this subject appeared in our April number.



native theory to that which I have called the principle of Fundamentalism, which claims for certain things a special mechanical guarantee that is non-prophetic and non-rational in its operation. Let us apply it for a moment to the creeds, of which the Apostles' creed belongs to the Common Law, and the Nicene to the Statute Law, of the Church. If the Church's authority is wholly prophetic and rational, there can obviously be no theoretical *a priori* guarantee that every statement of those creeds is correct. They were first of all accepted because it was believed on historical and rational grounds that what they said was true. Their contents were embodied in credal form on the ground of their accuracy: they were not thought accurate because they assumed a credal form. Faith was put in their own intrinsic truth, not in the method of their promulgation. And ultimately, in the last resort, they must now and always stand or fall by the same criterion. I say ultimately, because after the long and universal acceptance which they have enjoyed other considerations do enter in. Moreover, as a matter of practical politics it is inconceivable that they should be easily disowned and denied. But theoretically, and in the last resort practically too, they will last because they are true and not because they are creeds.

It seems to me personally far more likely that when Reunion comes the official creeds may be to some extent enlarged (as the Nicene Creed already has been more than once) than that they will ever be discarded. The effect of such action might be conceivably some modification of consequential ideas or shifting of balance. If I understand the situation right, Einstein's discoveries have altered the application of Newton's laws, so that the elect scientist now has more accurate and complete notions on certain physical matters than he had before: but Newton's laws, so far as they go, were true within their limitations, and in that sense irreversible: Einstein, by adding a new factor, merely corrected their application. If this is indeed the case, it illustrates my point about the creeds: they can be at once true and irreversible, and yet susceptible of being supplemented: and, if so, the notions derived from them may still at some future date be capable, at any rate in theory, of being made to represent more adequately the truths of God and salvation. If revelation is rational, no precise limit can be set to it. The Church will always be learning, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit. It is interesting to observe in this connection that Rome actually has added to the creeds certain dogmas bearing mainly on the doctrine of the Church, though the kind of additions which I have in mind in this paragraph would be additions bearing more directly upon our comprehension of God.



Meantime the creeds mark the point of progress already reached in the course of revelation more clearly in a sense than the Bible does, since their scope is more restricted, and since they embody reflection on the facts recorded in the Bible. That rational reflection on the meaning and bearing of the facts of the New Testament is still required is admitted by most intelligent people in all religious communions. In the Roman communion, for instance, it is vigorously employed in support of the cardinal modern doctrine of Papal Infallibility. If there is anyone who supposes that Roman Catholics despise reason, let him read the quite delightful recent volume by Fr. Vincent McNabb on *The New Testament Witness to Saint Peter*, which arrays with remarkable skill and power the evidence for the claim that St. Peter was the visible Vicar of Christ. In a noteworthy introduction Fr. McNabb distinguishes between the old form of appeal to Scripture as a mechanical oracle and the scientific treatment of it as a rational witness. "Appeal has usually been made to what we may call a mechanical or even a quantitative view of sacred Scripture. . . . With the coming of the new organic view of Holy Writ mere arithmetical processes are beginning to be set aside. Texts are no longer put together and summed up as in a problem of compound addition," but it is realized that some of the most important truths in the Bible are "suggested rather than proved," and "subtly postulated by the context rather than explicitly demonstrated by the text itself." Here is indeed noble testimony paid to rational methods of enquiry; and the book itself loyally observes these principles laid down in its introduction.

Much more could be said in support of rational in place of oracular authority than there is space to mention here. It is certainly the kind of authority to which the great Fathers appealed. In spite of their immense reverence for the text of Holy Scripture they argued out the problems that confronted them on their own merits. They were, in fact, preserved from any real taint of Fundamentalism by the fact that the heretics professed to support their case on Scripture too: so that between the two contradictory appeals to Scripture the issue had to be decided by reason or not at all.

It is also the only kind of authority which is at all likely to impress the modern intellectual world, which, while it is increasingly ready to admit the existence of fairly well-defined boundaries between the spheres of influence of different departments of thought, rightly suspects those who claim to ascertain truth by any other method than that of scientific and philosophic enquiry. And, finally, the appeal to the rational conviction of competent human observers would appear from the Gospels



to have been the method favoured by our Lord in dealing with His disciples. For the most part He seems to have left them, and expected them, to deduce for themselves not merely the application of His principles, but even the proper inferences from His life and actions. It is true that in certain instances (with reference, for example, to His resurrection and to His deity) He is said to have given them certain premonitory indications of the truth: but it is extremely significant that it is in just these instances that they failed at the time to comprehend His drift. His premonitory statements only served, and presumably were only meant to serve, for subsequent confirmation after they had reached the right conclusions by their own rational effort.

#### V. ANGLICAN PRACTICE

There can be no doubt to which ideal of authority the Church of England inclines. That Church, like any other corporate society, has its own standards for its members. But in support of those standards it has always appealed to learning and reason. It has refused to reckon as generally necessary to salvation anything that may not be proved from Holy Writ. But it has always, to some extent, treated the Bible as a reliable historical record rather than as an infallible oracle. It has always admitted and welcomed the appeal to ancient practice and patristic teaching as a means of interpreting the meaning of the Bible. Hooker, in the second book of his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, and again in the third book, utterly declines either to accept Scripture without reason to interpret it, or to allow that disparagement of reason which would extrude it from its own independent province parallel to that of Scripture. And in recent times every school of thought in the Church of England has accepted unreservedly (with quite insignificant exceptions) both the methods and the results of modern critical enquiry. As a body, Anglicans are now irretrievably committed to a conception of ultimate authority which is in its essence rational rather than oracular.

A body which possesses an infallible instrument of revelation and a universal supreme head of jurisdiction naturally tends to require a fairly exacting standard of conformity. When there is no possible theoretical ground for questioning an order or a direction, a severe discipline is the natural consequence. But the Church of England, since it asserted its independence in the sixteenth century, has consistently contented itself with requiring only a minimum standard of conformity. With general reason as its ultimate authority, it has attempted as far as possible to adopt individual conviction as its executive. Having set its



bounds wide in a most laudable attempt to maintain the unity of Christian men, it has allowed great latitude of interpretation within those bounds, and has refrained from imposing unnecessary tests on those who found for themselves a spiritual home within the borders set. On the whole, the Church has been content to know that their convictions were satisfied by adherence to her membership, and has not enquired further. Thus she has always sheltered men of divergent views and practices, and has not attempted to judge finally between them. Their divergence was their own affair, as their acceptance of her guidance and ministration was their own affair. No better instance of this could be mentioned than the acceptance of a bishopric by Reynolds, and the offer of others to Baxter and Calamy, in the full flush of the Restoration in 1661.

It is true enough that the Church of England was in some manner a persecuting Church in old days. But in those days, as in more recent times, coercion has proceeded rather from political interference than from the Church itself. I suppose it was the Test Acts which completed the utter discredit of the whole principle of coercing the laity. Certainly it is the Public Worship Regulation Act which has rendered it as near as may be to impossible to coerce the clergy. At the present moment he would be an optimist of the most irresponsible degree who would seriously appeal to anything but conscience and conviction for corporate expressions of unity in the English Church.

The official standards of the Church of England are tolerably clear both in respect of faith and of morals. But their practical recognition has become so modified by custom and disuse, and subsequent revival, that it is very hard indeed to draw any line at which it can be said that they are actually enforceable.

The Church of England claims to be reformed and Catholic. She has been at pains to disclaim any cleavage between herself and the historic Church of the Fathers and the Middle Ages. She retains the rites and ceremonies of the Church administered according to her own local use, as we are informed upon the title-page of the Prayer Book. When she affirmed her independence and reformed abuses, she was careful to preserve her continuity. Meantime she has experienced slumberings and stirrings and awakenings. There has been a singular lack of central leadership, and the immense efforts that have been made in the last two hundred and fifty years to reproduce ideals in action and to raise the lives of Churchmen in the direction of the standards of Churchmanship have been for the most part made by unofficial persons from below. The result is seen in the formation of groups and schools and movements which



from the nature of their origin and propagation have frequently tended to display a rather one-sided character. I venture to say that this is true of the Evangelical revival, the Tractarian movement, and the Liberal movement alike. They were all wanting in balance, though perhaps not all equally. There is some ground for thinking that in the present century some part of this one-sidedness may be in process of redress. But certainly the consequence remains that strong group loyalties have sprung up and taken root, which are not precisely identical with general loyalty to the ideals of the Church of England, but are rather expressions of adherence to one or other less or more complete aspect of the principles for which she stands as a whole. And though we may greatly regret some of the forms which have been assumed by these group loyalties, at their best each emphasizes something essential to Anglicanism.

So there exist concurrently in the present Church of England many sets of loyalties, which are not necessarily conflicting of their own nature, but often tend to become so. There are the old official ideals, now somewhat in need of fresh application and practical adjustment to the circumstances of modern life, which many who try to practise them are trying in their several ways to achieve. There are the different group ideals which have just been mentioned. There are also clamantly vociferous new ideals, some of which appear at least to be in conflict with the old ones. And, in addition, there exists a central school of mainly practical men who, although with wide sympathies for many of the ideals already catalogued, represent more directly than any of these the State connection of 1661, of which the most distinctive principles were opposition to Romanism, abhorrence of the principle and the necessity of non-conformity, and intolerance of "enthusiasm."

Most people will agree that centrifugal tendencies have gone too far, and that some workable system of discipline is urgently needed for the preservation of the body corporate as a distinctive entity. But the establishment of such a system can only come about if a very large measure of consent is first secured. It cannot be attained by arbitrary methods. At the moment it is possible for both clergy and laity, but especially for the latter, to claim almost unfettered liberty to think as they like and to do as they like, short of very grave moral scandals, without forfeiting the privileges of Church membership. Such a situation is intolerable in a society which claims to be the Body of Christ and to be guided by the Holy Spirit of God. There is even very considerable doubt whether a layman guilty of grave moral offence could be debarred from Communion if he persistently presented himself. Doubtless many priests would refuse him,



and many Bishops would do what they could to uphold the action of their clergy. But things might go hard with both priest and Bishop in the process of enforcing formal discipline. What discipline there is—and that, by the way, is not a negligible quantity—is of an informal character, and depends largely on the sense of decency, or *vis inertiae*, of its subject.

What the Church of England does, then, is to set forth a certain ideal of membership in her prescribed standards of Churchmanship, and leave it to the loyalty of her members to act thereon in accordance with their own rational convictions, which alone justify them in claiming to belong to her. A parallel may be drawn between her theory of authority and her practice of discipline. In the former matter she appeals to rational conviction, in the latter to conscientious loyalty: in neither does she look to coercion, whether of the intellect or of the will, to produce right results, but waits for the spiritual fruit of free response to rational leadings.

The result may sometimes be chaotic, but at least it is genuine and vital. The plan admits of abuse by the selfish and the intellectually or morally dishonest: within limits that circumstance must be tolerated, like the existence of evil at all in this world. It has a second and graver disadvantage, in that it makes little or no provision for the weak brethren, and those who are still babes in Christ: stumbling-blocks cannot but occur to these. The whole Anglican ideal presupposes a very high standard of general and religious education, which has as yet hardly begun to exist in fact. In this we enjoy a legacy from the Reformation, which paid its chief regard to the situation of the upper middle classes. And, thirdly, it makes for a great weakening of the Church's chief executive officers, though in some circumstances that may not be at all a bad result. On the other hand, it presents a perfectly magnificent ideal towards which to work, most deeply consonant with the mind of St. Paul, to look no higher. And it has the great practical advantage that new movements may be reflected in the corporate life with comparative ease and rapidity. There is much to be said in favour of a system which is decentralized and flexible.

LEONARD PRESTIGE.



## MISCELLANEA

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

AMONG contributors to the present issue, Dr. Bishop is a priest of the American Church, and his book *Spirit and Personality* was reviewed in these columns a few years ago. Mr. C. H. Smyth is a Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; we regret that, owing to an oversight, his contribution to last month's number was not marked as "to be concluded." The Rev. A. R. Browne-Wilkinson is Principal of St. Christopher's College, Blackheath, and many of our readers will know his contributions to the *Sunday School Chronicle*. Mr. C. H. Palmer is the author of a recent book on the Church in France; and the Rev. G. L. Prestige is Rector of Upper Heyford, Oxon, and formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford.

---

One of our readers asks for some guidance in this journal on the passages in the New Testament used by Theosophists in support of their teachings. We should be glad to hear from any of our readers who would feel disposed to deal with this subject.

---

Professor C. H. Turner, from whose pen we published an article last month on the South Indian Reunion scheme, asks us to state that, if the latest advices received as to the progress of the negotiations in India, and particularly as to the position of Confirmation in the reunited body, prove to be accurate, he would, were he writing now, feel obliged to express himself very differently.

---

The Rev. C. B. Moss writes as follows:

May I correct Mr. Dunkley's statement that "until 1923, we were the only marriageable clergy"? The Old Catholic Churches permit their clergy of all orders to marry after ordination. The Assyrian Church has for many centuries permitted priests and deacons (but not bishops, who are celibate) to do the same.

On the other hand, the Orthodox assembly of 1923, which sanctioned marriage after ordination, was not authoritative. No Orthodox Church allows it. The present rules are regarded as being ecumenical, and can therefore only be altered by a General Council, which cannot at present be held. Nor is it at all certain that such a Council of all the Orthodox Churches would consent to this change.

---

### NOTES ON PERIODICALS

*Analecta Bollandiana*, tom. xlvii., fasc. 1 and 2, has not perhaps quite as much general interest as usual, but it has quite as much historical value in details. Pères Delehaye and Grosjean show themselves as acute, industrious and accurate as ever; and the range of their knowledge is indeed remarkable. The former's chief contribution here is on the ancient hagiography of Ravenna, in which the influence of Galla Placidia on subsequent cults is emphasized and a list of little-known episcopal saints is given. Père Grosjean gives a catalogue of hagiographical MSS. in



Edinburgh libraries. Père Peeters elaborately expounds the life and martyrdom of Julian of Emesana. Maurice Coens subjects the legend of St. Ursula and the 11,000 virgins to close criticism, and shows that both the name of the saint and the number of the virgins are of late appearance. As always, the reviews are of great value, and English books receive much and unbiassed attention. Mr. Brittain's book on St. Giles receives due commendation; so do several recent Irish archæological works. Mr. Darlington's view that the original Anglo-Saxon MS. of the life of St. Wolfstan was taken to Rome and lost is not accepted. Mr. Peers's monograph on Finchale receives due commendation. In recent books of Dr. Coulton the learning is admitted, but the prejudice is sharply handled; the author seems to Fr. Delehaye to show quite obviously that his chief interest is in abuses and scandals in mediæval religion.

W. H. H.

*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.*

The opening article in the current number is on the conception of the Logos, and in the course of it Father Tobac considers its place in Johannine literature. He compares and contrasts the language employed by St. John in his Epistles and in the Apocalypse with that employed in the Fourth Gospel, and he has much to say about patristic and modern interpretations. In spite of formal resemblances he discerns differences between the Logos doctrine in the Gospel and in the Epistle. According to Father Tobac, the prologue of the Gospel, in the first three verses, speaks of Christ as pre-existing, the divine and personal Logos; whereas the Logos of the Epistle, in the first three verses, rather recalls the doctrine of life brought to the world by Jesus Christ during his earthly and public career. This difference is wrought out with consummate care. Father Leman sheds light on unpublished proposals dealing with the Great Schism of the West. These proposals were made by Chrétien Coc at the Synod of Lille in 1384. Father Leman's article links itself readily to the next one by Father Guillaume, who surveys the thought of Alonso de Madrid, whom he claims to be a precursor of that Catholic Reformation of which Erasmus was the leading spirit. Father Guillaume analyzes the chief work of this reformer, *L'Arte para servir à Dios*, and he analyzes it with the view of showing its relation to the other movements in thought during the early sixteenth century, for *L'Arte* was published in 1521. Nor is this tract simply a piece of work found by a scholar. In its own day *L'Arte* exercised no little influence on such different folk as Hentenius and Kinkius, as well as upon St. Ignatius and St. Theresa. The reviews attain their high level of excellence, and there is a notable one of M. de Faye's second and third volumes on *Origen*. At the end of this important magazine there is a careful list of articles on ecclesiastical history published in the different foreign periodicals, and this of itself renders it indispensable to all serious students.

R. H. M.

*Zeitschrift für die A.T.liche Wissenschaft.* 1929. Heft 1.

This number is mainly concerned with excavations and technical linguistic points. A long article by W. F. ALBRIGHT on the American Excavations at Tell Beit Mirsim (the Debir, or Kirjath-Sepher—so LXX—of Josh. xv. 49) establishes the following conclusions. The top city, A., was destroyed c. 588 in the last Chaldæan invasion; Torrey's theory, that the life of Southern Judæa was not interrupted, is not substantiated.



The next city, B., was destroyed by Shishak c. 912. It was built on the ruins of C., the site being occupied immediately, during the period 1250-1200. Now Jericho, Bethel and Ai were occupied by the Hebrews not later than 1500, so that the conquest of the South was long afterwards. E. BAUMANN studies the phrase "turn our captivity." In Ps. cxxvi. 4 "turn our captivity as the rivers in the Negeb" is impossible. The streams go underground in the dry season. The idea is not that of a portion of the people going into captivity, but of the whole people being punished, the punishment being figured as a kind of *descensus ad inferos*. The same root meaning is appropriate elsewhere: cf. Ezek. xvi. 53 of "Sodom and her daughters."

W. K. L. C.

*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses.* April, 1929.

The first and principal article in this number is a careful study by Fr. F. Cayré on St. Augustine's teaching on the mediated knowledge of God which the human soul may acquire by the grace of "Wisdom" considered as a Gift of the Holy Spirit. The article examines at some length those stages in the growth of Divine Knowledge wherein the soul by contemplation of "Ideas," such, *e.g.*, as Being, the True or the Good, arrives at a mediated knowledge aided by a proper use of that analogy which exists between human perfections and the Divine Attributes. Fr. Cayré combines deep spirituality with profound Augustinian learning, but the article hardly lends itself to abstraction within our present limits.

Another article treats of the sense in which a divine origin may be rightly claimed for the civil power as exercised in a secular state. This power, it is contended, does indeed come from God but in the natural order. God is its Author in the sense that He has created man with such a nature that he must live in society, and life in society implies the exercise of civil authority. There follows an historical sketch of the confused discussions of this question since Carolingian times. The ceremony of the "sacring of Kings" had the effect of putting the matter in a false light as it seemed to imply a sort of sacerdotal character in the monarch; he was, in fact, thought of as a kind of bishop. Fanciful bits of exegesis of scriptural texts like the "two swords" of St. Luke xxii. 38 led thinkers further astray. In the thirteenth century, however, St. Thomas Aquinas introduced a saner outlook and argued for the natural origin of all civil authority. He followed Aristotle in basing it upon the facts of human nature and the needs of men. The troubles of the sixteenth century forced thinkers to clarify their ideas everywhere, but in the next century the question was again in confusion owing to the theory of "Divine Right." The writer concludes this very interesting study of an important question by saying that to give directions about civil or political matters is no part of the mission of the Church, and that where in history such directions have been given, often quite rightly and properly, they are merely accidental to that mission and are of ecclesiastical right only. The Church has no divine authority to make kings or other magistrates, a "sacring" or coronation ceremony is a blessing only.

A third article examines the idea of Divine Sonship as it appears in the Gospels. Our Lord's incomparable holiness and purity do not of themselves necessarily involve Divine Sonship. But in St. Matthew xxiii. 8-10 we find our Lord assuming a rôle hitherto reserved to God alone, and proclaiming that He is the sole Guide (*καθ' ἑαυτὴν*) to salvation.



St. Matthew again, by a slight addition which he makes to the LXX text of Isaiah xlii. 1-4, when he quotes the passage in chapter xii. 18 of his Gospel, lets it be seen that he believes in Christ's Divinity, using of Him the phrase *ὁ ἀγαπητός μου*, which is equivalent to the *μονογενής* of St. John.

There are other articles of interest, many reviews of books, and the usual exhaustive bibliography of recent theological literature.

W. R. V. BRADE.

*British Museum Quarterly.* Vol. iii., Nos. 3 and 4.

Lovers of Greek antiquities will delight in the new model of the Nereid monument which has recently been placed on exhibition and is illustrated and described in the *Quarterly*. The new model differs in some important respects from the old, which has been exhibited in the Nereid Room for the greater part of a century.

A further illustrated account is given of the sensational discoveries at Ur of the Joint Expedition of the British Museum and the University of Pennsylvania Museum. Many objects on view last summer have returned to Baghdad; the rest are divided between London and Philadelphia as before. London receives what is perhaps the most important find up to the present, the lapis and shell inlaid "standard," on which the royal court is pictured; it has been called the "Bayeux Tapestry" of Sumer. It is interesting to note that progress is being made with the preparation of electrotype facsimiles of some of the most important objects from the royal tombs.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

*The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought.* Vol. vi., Nos. 1 and 2.

A Presbyterian minister, who writes (in No. 1) that the "tremendous and awful silence immediately following the consecration at the Scottish communions which so moved the soul of Robert Louis Stevenson is fast becoming a lost tradition" among the reformed Churches, enters a plea for the neglected feature of silence in public worship, and recommends a small booklet published by S.P.C.K. of which the name is withheld. Professor Scott (in No. 2) adduces in a racy and delightful way convincing reasons for the study of Hebrew. In the same number the Editor opens our eyes to a situation in the West regarding Universities and their relation to the State which sounds not a little alarming.

*The Journal of Religion.* Vol. ix., No. 2.

The April number of this, the University of Chicago's, *Quarterly* contains a valuable article on the crisis at Antioch in which the author, Benjamin W. Bacon, sees the issue as lying between the Petrine gospel of compromise accepted by the whole apostolic circle at the Jerusalem Council and the Pauline gospel of unrestricted faith in Christ, to be tempered only by consideration for the weaker brother. St. Peter triumphed and remained in control at Antioch, and St. Paul retired to seek a new base for his missionary activities in the Greek Churches of Asia Minor. When St. Paul left the private conference he had had with the Pillars it was in the joyful conviction that everything needful for the proclamation of his gospel of free grace among the Gentiles had been conceded. Quite naturally,



therefore, he and St. Barnabas expected that their Greek converts would be fraternally welcomed to the communal repasts at Antioch, as indeed for a time they were. St. Peter himself, coming to Antioch in the spirit of the Jerusalem right-hand of fellowship, ate with the Gentiles. But such an action by the chief of the Apostles was too much for the Pharisee-Christians, and precipitated the crisis. Their complaint to Jerusalem brought about the Jerusalem Council. SS. Paul and Barnabas having left for their first missionary journey before the deliberations of the Council were completed, the result was not known to them until their return from Galatia, when they found that those of Jewish birth, including St. Peter, had withdrawn from table fellowship with the Gentiles: action which was apparently due to the influence of certain delegates from Jerusalem who interpreted the decrees as providing a *modus vivendi*. St. Mark, St. Barnabas, and St. Peter agreed with this interpretation as did everyone else concerned—except St. Paul. He was so affected that he preferred to surrender all that had been gained by his alliance with St. Barnabas and association with the Antioch Church and start out anew with Silas, a new ally, towards the unknown West. St. Peter and the principle of compromise remained triumphant at Antioch, and the magnitude of that triumph is confirmed by the results of research into the history of Synoptic tradition, for not only does it show the Gospel foundation to be Petrine, but that the source of locality, if not Antioch itself, is Northern Syria, where, rather than at Rome, St. Peter was held in highest veneration. But though St. Peter's triumph was so complete, it was only temporary. St. Paul retrieved his position magnificently by ten years' unremitting labour and the establishment of a Greek centre at Ephesus; by his great attempt at reconciliation, an attempt for which he risked and ultimately lost both liberty and life (Acts xxi. 18-19); and by his letters, which have become the foundation of Christian Theology. The victory ultimately was his, and was the better for the delay. A hellenistic and Pauline doctrine of Incarnation met half-way a Jewish and Petrine doctrine of the Lordship in Heaven of a glorified Son of Man. The weak link in the chain appears to us to be the suggestion that SS. Paul and Barnabas left while the deliberations were still in progress at Jerusalem, but even if that link does not stand the strain there does not appear any serious reason why the rest of the argument should not stand, substantially at all events. The attempted summary above cannot, of course, do full justice to a closely argued paper that deserves careful consideration.

H. S. M.

---

*The International Review of Missions.* April, 1929.

The Rev. Dr. F. Rawlinson calls attention to the presence of a real religious revolution which has marched side by side with the political movement during the past twenty years in China and to a revived interest in things religious. Miss A. M. Cable describes work and conditions in Central Asia; the latter are severe and workers are few. The Rev. E. K. Higdon illustrates the efforts which are being made to harness the nationalist aspirations in the Philippines to the development of an indigenous Protestant Church, but the population is overwhelmingly of the Roman obedience. An encouraging sketch of efforts made in Brazil to carry out the Jerusalem message comes from the Rev. E. Braga; here again the dominant influence is Rome. Educationists will be interested in the Rev. Dr. W. A. Hill's paper on the work of the American Northern Baptists,



and in the findings presented by a group of missionaries interested in African education. Mr. P. O. Philip shows what use is now being made in India of the opportunities afforded by a changed outlook to develop indigenous expressions of the spirit of Christianity: music, poetry, Sadhuism, the *ashram* are all being utilized, but the movement is yet in its infancy. The Rev. Dr. A. H. Clark discusses the problems raised by the policy of devolution—*i.e.*, how much is essential of what the missionary brings, and how much may and should be replaced by the thought and practice of the native; how far and in what degree should the native be given control; he thinks that spiritual control should come first, and that control over institutions and organizations should be developed gradually. Remarkable figures are given by Miss Ruth Rouse of the modern "dispersions" of Africans and Orientals (France admits 600,000 Africans annually); a good deal is done for these migrants, and by their own Churches as well as by Europeans, but the work is hindered by denominational divisions, by language, by mental outlook, by grievances against the white man; on the other hand, migrants are accessible and free from traditional handicap: they produce leaders, and their variety makes for a true catholicity. Miss M. M. Underhill contributes some German criticisms passed on the Jerusalem Conference; these relate to the difficulty of securing adequate representation of local Churches; the absence of continental help in the preparation of the preliminary papers; and the sense of mental alienation from the Anglo-Saxon, British and American. Dr. H. H. Weir urges the continued importance of medical work in the mission field.

---

*The Church Overseas.* April, 1929.

Canon Quick, writing about the Lausanne and Jerusalem conferences, points out the vital connection between reunion and missionary work; he shows that the modern enemy of all religion—*i.e.*, secularism—is due partly to the modern feature of specialization in all branches of knowledge, which has made all philosophies selective rather than ultimate; and partly to the industrial revolution, which has dazzled the rich with new toys and dazed the poor with mechanical labour or fear for their livelihood; only Christianity can redeem the situation, but it still speaks with many voices; he thinks the danger of Pan-Protestantism exaggerated, and that Catholicism and Protestantism are not so incompatible as is often feared; in modern sincerity he sees the mind of Christ, and he notes that both conferences emphasized the Person and the mind of Christ, and rejected the doctrine of infallible or irreformable documents. The Bishop of Uganda defends the proposal for a province of East Africa, already accepted in idea by seven out of the eight dioceses concerned; and he finds greater objections to the alternatives either of postponement or of a province of Uganda alone or of a province of North-east Africa, than to a province of East Africa as suggested. The Bishop of Yukon sends an account of the Anglican Church in Canada, and the Bishop of Ely discusses the opportunities, problems, and needs lying before us at home. Dr. H. H. Weir pleads for medical missions as an expression of the spirit of our Lord, and that the latter should be the motive of all medical work abroad. Mr. A. E. Mulgan tells a happy story of how the New Zealand Government is doing its best to compensate the Maories for injustices committed in war more than half a century ago.

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.



## REVIEW

RAMON LULL. A Biography. By E. Allison Peers, M.A.  
S.P.C.K., London. 18s.

In this careful biography, Professor Peers has well supplied what was a crying need in the English world.

Is there another schoolman of the Middle Ages who has left so great a bulk of writing for posterity as Lull? Assuredly none other has given us so many books on subjects so various. It is possible in Ramon for the man of today to become intimate with a great Christian intellect of the Middle Ages. Lull's lovers learn to recognize his favourite phrases, to greet his eager, rushing spirit and reverence the soaring of his devotion, to anticipate and welcome his leading ideas, to mark his little foibles, to know some of the characters he loves to draw and the backgrounds against which he places them, to know, even, some of his favourite anecdotes, in a way that is only possible when a well-beloved author has stamped himself on a considerable body of work. In the literature of Europe this man holds a place as pioneer, as a writer of fiction in his own vivid Catalan a century before Chaucer. Among mystical writers, too, his place is distinctive. He is of all the mystics the most chivalrous, at once the lover and the knight of the unseen Beloved. Again, in the thought-life of the Church, Lull is strongly individual, for his whole outlook on the Faith is coloured by the great apologetic of his life to Islam. His deep concern for his own Christianity was only born at most a few days before his great concern for the evangelization of Moslems. Consequently, his studies in Christian theology and his studies in Arabic literature went on *pari passu*, with a double result in his thinking. Not only is his deliberate apologetic singularly understanding of the Moslem mediæval mind, but his own grasp of Christianity and turn of devotion seems half Oriental. Did any other Christian, let alone a Christian who was himself converted by a vision of the Crucified, linger so lovingly and continuously in his prayers among the "attributes" of God? Where another mystic will find the door into infinity opened by the contemplation of the Passion, away soars Ramon among those "attributes" (*ṣifât allah*).

And this very individual mind was that of a virile, tireless personality playing its part in a Mediterranean world of fascinating complexity. The Mediterranean was Ramon's lake, from Spain to Alexandretta, from Genoa to Tunis, and that in days when James the Conqueror was flaunting overseas, when Marco



Polo was returning with strange tales to Venice, when the fall of Acre ended an epoch, when the poor, badgered Celestine V., that truly haunting figure, was caught as he made for a fisherman's boat, when Eastern philosophers and artists were at home in the ports of Sicily, when the Knights Templars met their doom and the Knights Hospitallers became the Knights of Rhodes. All these happenings on the shores of Ramon's Mediterranean played their part in his life. And he himself, ubiquitous as the ships of his Catalan countrymen, played also in that moving world a notable and active part. His life was a strange and rich combination of perpetual motion and steady contemplation. "The Procurator of the Infidels" at papal and royal courts, the "Bearded Doctor" hot in discussion at mediæval universities, was also (as Mallorcan people love to call one of his books) the *gran contemplador*, and truest lover of his Lord.

Concerning such a man, the English language had, until Professor Peers got to work, no biography save a few slight though sympathetic missionary sketches.

Professor Peers, who, since he joined the company of good Lullists, has given English people translations of several of Ramon's books of devotion or romance, will not claim for this new book that it is the final word in Lullian scholarship. He does not attempt to solve for us the question of the relationship of the two contemporary lives in Catalan and Latin that are and must be the primary sources of all biographies of Ramon. Exhaustive work on manuscript sources he leaves for scholars of leisure. What he does give us is of far more importance for the English-speaking world—viz., a careful and sympathetic summary of the main results reached by the Lullist scholars of Europe, and of Lull's printed works, whether the Latin books of the great eighteenth-century edition of Salzinger, or the Catalan books published with such pious care by the Mallorcan Lullists of the modern Catalan revival, or the several isolated volumes published by scholars and admirers old and new. These books Professor Peers has read and marked, together with the principal European works on Lull. And the result of such reading which he now gives to us will be entirely fresh to most English readers.

They will learn to know a Lull who lived in a busy, palpitating, international, yet strangely complete world, with hell beneath it and the seven heavens above. And they will find their ever-journeying Lull as great a Methodist as John Wesley, whom in his restless, stern singleness of heart he much resembles. With Lull even chaos seems to assume a kind of orderliness when he arranges it under its four qualities of "igneity, aereity,



aqueity, terreity." It was no small world of which this incessant methodizer was a citizen. He was ever conscious from his early *Doctrina Pueril* to his late *Quæ lex sit magis bona* of the clash of three great faiths, "the three laws" of his constant phrase. These, Judaism, Islam, and Christianity, in their contents and mutual relationship he early methodized, threshing the matter out, with wonderful tolerance for his age, in "The Book of the Gentile and the Three Wise Men," and many a subsequent work. (That Gentile, by the way, with his *tabula rasa* mind, brought by arguments to acknowledge God, should be carefully compared with the earlier character, *Hayy ibn Yaqthan* of Ibn Tufayl.)

Into Lull's orderly and compact universe came, as this book will show, two profoundly disturbing elements. One is the creedless "Tartar," subject to none of the "three laws," with his way of opening dim and far geographical vistas and the disturbing fears he brings to Lull lest he shall be Islamized before he is brought to Christ—fears how well justified in all that his Islamization has meant for the course of this world! The second disturbing element was the Averroist movement in the Christian universities. Did Lull hurl himself passionately against this movement because he saw in it Islam creeping into the Christian camp? Or was it rather (since Ibn Rushd was no accepted champion of orthodox Islam) because of the disturbing effect on his whole compact and exquisitely fitted universe of a system which advocated "the two truths," seeking to wrench asunder theology and philosophy and so pull down the great structure of the mediæval Christian intellect?

To such a mind as this, with its struggles and its heroisms, Professor Peers supplies an introduction. And we are grateful to our English Lullist for his careful references and documentation, which make us feel that he is pointing the way for each of us to follow up the trail that pleases him. We are grateful, too, for the excellent bibliography at the end of the volume, even while deploring that a bare list must place such exact and erudite bibliographical work as that of Père Ephrem Longpré, in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, on a level with quite slender contributions. We thank Professor Peers for giving a most just tribute to Père Longpré on p. 397. That Father has put not only the author of this biography but all Lullists in his debt.

Perhaps of all the lines of study suggested by Longpré's work, that which most appeals to the present reviewer is a further tracing out of Lull's relationship to his predecessors in European thought, such as St. Bonaventura. The indebtedness of Lull's mind to Christian thinkers must, in the opinion



of the reviewer, be worked out simultaneously with its indebtedness to Arabic philosophers, or neither line of research will come to the truth about Lull, who was mentally the pupil of both East and West. It would be too much to expect that Professor Peers should have carried us far in such research while the exacting and difficult work of the biography was upon him. Now that he has enriched us with this most useful book (henceforth the welcome and inevitable "Companion to Lullian Studies" for English readers), may we not respectfully suggest to him these further worlds to conquer?

CONSTANCE E. PADWICK.

---

## NOTICES

OLD TESTAMENT ESSAYS. By R. H. Kennett, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d.

A fundamentalist Professor from America, addressing a meeting recently in this country, made the remark: "I am a Professor, and I spend a half of my time in saying 'I don't know.'" We of the critical school have to confess often enough our ignorance, but men like Professor Kennett feel that it is well worth while to make the *endeavour* to answer difficult questions. Nor does he claim always to have arrived at final truth; rather he seems to say, Here is my attempt, what is yours?

Essay I. is upon "The Early Narrative of the Jahvistic Document of the Pentateuch." Canon Kennett, while following the most commonly accepted hypothesis of the sources "J," "D," and "P," is not content until he has tried to find in the political and ecclesiastical history of Israel a setting for the composition of each one of these documents severally and for their successive amalgamations. The author has written upon this aspect of the subject elsewhere (see, *e.g.*, *J.T.S.*, January, 1905; *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, 1920); but so far as the present volume covers the same ground the investigation is carried further. Indeed, Dr. Kennett's treatment exhibits a striking contrast to the extremely scanty discussion within (shall we say?) the 500-page volume upon the Hexateuch by Carpenter-Harford. Essays cognate are (II.) "Ezekiel," and (III.) "The Jewish Priesthood."

The longest paper is the sixth, bearing the title "The Historical Background of the Psalms" (100 pages), and it cannot fail to interest every reader. The Professor's exposure of an age-long argument in a circle is thorough; in a word, "the idea of David commonly held is, indeed, founded almost exclusively on the psalms, of which he has been supposed to be the author" (p. 120). Recent Continental work has tended to show the essential antiquity of many of the psalms, but the real problem which Canon Kennett sets himself (as the present writer understands it) is to endeavour to explain the circumstances in which the psalms as units and the psalter as a whole came into their present form. The chapters on the Altar Fire and the Day of Atonement are full of new points, and



the final essay concerning "The Origin and Development of the Messianic Hope" forms an excellent basis for discussion.

The present volume, like Dr. Kennett's Schweich lectures, and indeed all his work, is valuable not least in the buried gold which his plough turns up in the course of ploughing his furrow. Dr. Kennett's former pupils, and the many clergy who have heard him at clerical gatherings, will be glad to have in a collected form this further summary of his distinctive teaching set out in his own inimitably vivid fashion.

R. S. CRIPPS.

LES ORIGINES HUMAINES ET L'EVOLUTION DE INTELLIGENCE. By Edouard le Roy. Membre de l'Institut. (Paris: Boivin. 20 fr.)

Any readers of THEOLOGY who happen to be acquainted with M. le Roy's *L'exigence idéaliste et le fait de l'évolution* will welcome the publication of the complete text of his lectures, delivered at the Collège de France in 1927 and 1928, on Human Origins and the Evolution of Intelligence. The course is divided into five sections, the first three lectures being devoted to a statement of the biological problem, the analysis of the "phénomène humaine," and the determination of man's place in nature. The fact that the human organism is capable of reflective and creative intelligence differentiates mankind from the rest of creation, and gives to "l'empire de l'Homme" a unique position in the evolutionary process. This "sphère de l'esprit," or *Noosphère*, is contrasted with the rest of the organic world—the *biosphère* as M. le Roy calls "la notion de la réelle unité que possède la couche vivante qui entoure le globe et qui, en maintes circonstances, fonctionne d'ensemble comme un véritable organisme d'ordre supérieure."

The emergence of man from the "biosphère" is worked out with great learning and ingenuity as a "transformation vitale," summed up in the expression *l'hominisation*, and constituting a new order of reality comparable to the advent of life in assemblages of matter. "La naissance de l'Homme ait été l'effet d'une invention authentique, une genèse de nouveauté irréductible." The volume, in fact, is a profound investigation of the process of "hominisation" based upon the conception of life as "invention," which merits the careful attention of theologians and philosophers already acquainted with the work of Professor Lloyd Morgan in this country. Anthropologists will find here a careful and accurate review of the latest scientific evidence concerning human origins, while the discussion of the complex problem of variation can hardly fail to stimulate and interest the biologist.

The main part of the course has been devoted to an analysis of the scientific data with a view to the determination of the evolution of intelligence from its earliest manifestations in tool-making and the kindling of fire, through the sequence of Palæolithic cultures, to the Neolithic and Metal ages, down to historic and contemporary times. There is much that we should wish to say about this section of the book, packed as it is with suggestive thought, but this review is scarcely the occasion for an anthropological discussion. In passing, however, it may be remarked that the claims of Africa as a possible cradle-land of the human race cannot be dismissed, in view of recent "tendencies," quite as summarily as M. le Roy seems to imagine. This, however, is not to deny that there is also a strong case for a southern Asiatic original home. At present the data are insufficient to establish a definite hypothesis.



It is, however, the philosophical theme running throughout this interesting volume that gives it a special claim on the attention of readers of THEOLOGY. "Hominisation" regarded as an "invention," he maintains, indicates the reality of the metaphysical concept of creation, the key to evolution being found only by observing human life elevated to power and worth. He shows the fallacy of representing life as an accidental character rather than as a concrete reality. Mind cannot be separated from matter, for thought now appears as a function of life intimately associated with the nervous system. It is, therefore, easier to think of the universe in terms of creative evolution than of creative thought. At each advance something new has been added, till at last man appeared as a new creation (or "invention" as M. le Roy would say) still bearing the stamp of his lowly origin, but equipped with a God-like intelligence which has penetrated into the secrets of Nature, and a divine spirit capable of spiritual experience.

E. O. JAMES.

---

THE GOSPEL AND ITS TRIBUTARIES. By E. F. Scott, D.D. T. and T. Clark. 10s.

Dr. E. F. Scott's books are familiar to all students of the New Testament. This volume, consisting of Kerr Lectures delivered in Glasgow, is as fresh and stimulating as his previous writings. He is one of those authors from whom we learn all the more because he often prompts us to disagree with him. In these lectures he undertakes to show how Christianity "drew into itself many tributary elements," Jewish and pagan, but yet by a power residing in itself transformed them so as to preserve its own identity. "The more we understand what Christianity received, the more clearly we discern what it gave." "The Gospel was at once the result of a long development and a new revelation." Dr. Scott performs his task with independence and charm. His book is a really valuable contribution to the understanding of the New Testament. If we criticize particular points, that is not in the least because we do not appreciate the excellence of the whole.

Our main criticism of Dr. Scott's handling of his theme is that he is at times obsessed by a sense of opposition between points of view where no necessary opposition exists. Thus he rightly affirms that Christianity is more than a moral system (p. 13). But he criticizes the Logos-doctrine, even in Hebrews, as leading to an impoverishment of Christian ideas. "Access to God ceases to involve that inward harmony with his will which makes us his children" (p. 174). Is, then, the metaphysical necessarily the enemy of the moral? Or is it not more true to say that worship and morality both postulate a metaphysical basis, if they are to endure? The Logos idea was introduced not from any desire for speculation, but to safeguard the absolute reality of Christian life and devotion. So, again, more than once he alludes to a conflict between liberty and authority in terms that suggest that he has not really thought out the meaning of either. There are several statements to which we demur—e.g., "To Jesus himself the mystical idea was foreign" (p. 120). "The belief in the Spirit . . . was something additional to" the teaching of Jesus (p. 38). Nor are we persuaded that St. Paul, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, was the arch-hellenizer that Dr. Scott bids us suppose; or that he ever regarded the flesh as essentially rather than empirically evil, under the



influence of Hellenistic thought (p. 146). Dr. Scott, too, minimizes the outward unity and discipline of the apostolic Church. It is impossible to read such an epistle as 1 Corinthians without seeing that apostolic supervision was something very vigorous. But we do not wish to end on a note of criticism. We hope that all theological students will study this book.

E. J. BICKNELL.

CHRISTIAN THOUGHT: A GRAMMAR OF REINTERPRETATION; OR, CHRISTIANITY AND NATURE. By F. W. Butler. S.P.C.K. 6s.

This small book is a sequel to the author's *Christianity and History*. It has the same emphasis upon "a theology of action" and upon the significance of Christianity as an "ethic of deed." The author finds abundant justification for this emphasis in recent philosophy. The recognition of autonomous domains discloses a problem of the self in its contrast to nature. But the contrast problem also shows the difficulties of soul-making for which a solution must be sought in religion. Thus we have a "unitary problem of religion"; and, once the problem is rightly set, it can be shown that Christianity is not only the supreme answer, but actually the final religion. The solution of the contrast-problem is to be found in the Deed of God in history, and Christian thought flows from experience of this deed. Thus action provides a key to truth, Troeltsch's polymorphism is answered, and the irrationalism of other moderns is transcended.

It is unfortunate that the author's brief statement of his starting-point should leave so much unexplained. Why, for example, does he assume mechanism and "mechanical laws" in nature, when all that has here been implied is today sharply questioned? Or, again, that over-worked word "personality" has no longer the magic value which Mr. Butler attributes to it. Too many people are using it to support positions which he would be the first to repudiate. Consequently a repeated statement of the contrast-problem in terms of "personality" *versus* "mechanism" has an old-fashioned air. Some of the terminology here employed seems to look backwards to a situation already past. Still, the author has set his face in the right direction. Much that he has to say is so excellent as to outweigh in importance any criticisms which his book suggests.

L. S. THORNTON.

CHRIST, THE WISDOM OF MAN. By A. Boyd Scott. Hodder and Stoughton. 15s.

This is an attractive and stimulating study of our Lord as an ethical teacher. The rich and allusive style of the author and the excellent type provided by the printers combine to make the book a pleasure to read. The author's method is to seek to correlate the ethical teaching of Jesus with that of the great teachers like the Stoics, Butler, Kant, Green, Bergson, Nietzsche, and others, a promising method, likely to elicit in comparative completeness the main features of a body of teaching like that of our Lord, which for all its unity is not a technical system. The result is a fresh and illuminating presentation of the spirit of our Lord's ethical teaching. Many good points are made in the sections on His teaching about "rewards" and on His attitude towards the Law. Of



the latter it is said: "He handles it (the Law) as an assistant in its nativity."

The difficulty of treating any one part or aspect of our Lord's teaching is that it ultimately involves His whole life. His ethical teaching involves the teaching about the Kingdom of God, and with that is bound up the whole course of His ministry and its culmination.

On the crucial issue of the nature of the Kingdom, Dr. Scott has not taken seriously enough its apocalyptic aspects, in which the supernatural and the ethical are so intimately united. The author's failure in this point leads to other weaknesses in his presentation. He has not really come to terms with the emphasis which our Lord, at least at some time in His ministry, laid on renunciation and self-discipline in connection with the transcendent claim and value of the Kingdom.

Again, the book proceeds to seek the ethical "horizon" of Jesus, and this is found "in a 'spirit' within Him which is recessed beyond what is customarily called 'religion' in general, and His 'religion' in particular—a 'spirit' indeed, in which may be discerned the radical *motif* not only of morality and religion, but of thought and art as well, and the restoration of which within the soul of man constitutes Christ's unexampled contribution to the significance and conduct of life." Surely, in this "spirit of wholeness" (called by the author "piety"), of reaction to Reality, religion is the synthesizing element, ideally in all men and actually in our Lord. For Him the Kingdom includes all values, and is a *religious* conception. If our Lord regarded the external world "with free and friendly eyes" it was because of His religious knowledge of God's Fatherhood. It is difficult to find anything in our Lord's ethical teaching which is not based on and saturated with religious feeling and ideas.

Consequently, in spite of the interesting way in which the author works out his conception of Christianity as being essentially the possessor and propagation of this spirit of "piety," we think few will agree with him when he doubts whether "religion is the source or inspiration or secret of his (our Lord's) moral wisdom." Indeed, his own insistence on the place of the Church and of "the supernatural rite called the Lord's Supper" in mediating the work of Jesus would seem to belie his thesis.

H. J. CARPENTER.

---

TRUE RELIGION: SERMONS PREACHED BY THE LATE W. PAGE-ROBERTS, M.A., D.D. London: John Murray. 3s. 6d.

These thirteen sermons, very typical of the preacher, will, with his *Law and God*, preserve the memory of a great Victorian. They, too, are based on real religious experience, but experience of an equable "once-born" kind, representing the thought and emotion of the educated Forsyte, who found his spiritual home in Vere Street. Indeed, one may say that if Harley Street and Lincoln's Inn had not found a Page-Roberts they would have had to invent one. One is a little puzzled at the immense reputation of the author of these sermons presented in cold type, but the Dean was aided by a charming manner, a delightful voice, sincerity, tact, good sense, slightly by the pose of one who could set the world right, and above all by the happy accident (or providence) that he exactly suited his worshippers.

W. J. FERRAR.



**THE SOWER.** A study in the Parable of Parables. By C. Bell. Mowbray. 4s. 6d.

Canon Bell has written an interesting and suggestive book. His aim is to study afresh our Lord's diagnosis of the state of individual souls, to test some widely-accepted estimates of the meaning of Revelation by an examination of the Parable, and to consider ways in which it bears upon the ideals and difficulties of the Clergy. In the first chapter he discusses the meaning of our Lord's answer to the question of the disciples, Why speakest thou to them in parables? "Christ," he says, "wrapped up His teaching in parables because He knew that men could never realize it unless they thought about it." In his chapters on the various soils he follows Archbishop Trench in pointing out that by the grace of God the hard soil may become soft (as in St. Paul's case), the shallow soil deep (as in St. Peter's case), and the thorn-choked soil clear. In his last chapter he insists on the "essential goodness of human nature," and advises that all men should be treated as good and so helpful "to plough up the hard ground, to cast out the rocks, and weed away the thorns." Throughout the book there runs a note of optimism greatly needed in these days. Equally valuable are his warnings against impatience and a desire for quick spiritual returns. Altogether a book for the times.

H. W. FULFORD.

**THE TREASURY OF THE FAITH.** 9. *Man and his Destiny*, C. C. Martindale; 13. *Jesus Christ: Man of Sorrows*, Archbishop Goodier; 18. *The Supernatural Virtues*, T. E. Flynn; 26. *Sin and Repentance*, E. J. Mahoney; 34. *The Resurrection of the Body*, J. McCann; 35. *The Church Triumphant*, J. P. Arendzen. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 1s. paper, 2s. cloth.

Previous reviews of this series have laid stress on the differences between Roman and Anglican teaching. The present batch of six volumes is remarkable in that they contain little or nothing that is not systematically taught from Anglican pulpits. Occasionally a modern-minded member of a congregation would think the phrasing a little old-fashioned, but if he were candid he would recognize that, so far as Anglican tradition went, he rather than the preacher was the innovator. Needless to say, these dogmatic truths common to the two Churches are here expressed with more clarity and theological sureness than is often the case in our utterances. Two particularly interesting discussions may be singled out, those dealing with venial sin in No. 26, and with the identity of the risen body in No. 34.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

**THE HERO IN THY SOUL.** Being an attempt to face life gallantly. By A. J. Gossip. T. and T. Clark. 7s.

Professor Gossip's book is issued in the *Scholar as Preacher* Series. There are two types of scholar-preacher, as there are two types of scholar; there is the scholar-preacher of the Rashdall type, whose bent it is to introduce the scholar's point of view and intellectual acquisitions to a wider audience than the academic, and there is the scholar who starts from the fundamental certainties and difficulties of the ordinary human



being, and throws upon their vague and shifting outlines the sure and varied beams of light from a mind profoundly cognizant of the place of the Christian attitude in the widest realm of thought and life, and steeped in the continuous affirmations of the religious thinkers of all time. He thinks with the man in the street at that man's best, and from the widths and depths of his own trained mind he enlarges and enriches and steadies "the weaker brother." This book is a brilliant example of such work. The writer's religious experience is the basis of all that he teaches, especially in his treatment of the Cross and the Resurrection, and his culture is extremely wide, enabling him to take a very firm line with such modern phases of thought as the pessimism of Hardy. Moreover, it is so well written that one does not wish to lay it down: It should be introduced to the modern educated man.

W. J. FERRAR.

THE REBUILDING OF THE CHURCH. By J. F. Mozley. Robert Scott. 7s. 6d.

If there are still any who are "at ease in Zion" they should read this book. Also if there are any who fail to realize the magnitude of the task involved in healing "our unhappy divisions" this is the book for them. For it assures us, with much detailed illustration of the conviction, that our main danger is in our comparatively superficial insights; reading "the face of the sky" but not discerning "the signs of the times." "A penetrating sincerity" is the primary religious virtue—so A. N. Whitehead insists in *Religion in the Making*, and the same note sounds in the pages of this book. Whether, however, this is quite enough either for a description of the genius of religion or for edification of the Body of Christ may legitimately be questioned.

Let it suffice that this book should further that call to change of heart and mind which, with allied intentions, has recently sounded forth from both York and Canterbury. Certainly it provides ample materials for self-examination, and that in the widest sense, for it spares neither Rome, nor Geneva, nor any halting-places between them. But if we are to build again the old waste places, we shall need some more comfortable words than those Mr. J. F. Mozley provides. Reflection may reveal the shortcomings of that past which we inherit, but "experience worketh hope."

"We have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us the noble works . . .

" . . . arise, help us, and deliver us for thine honour."

F. W. BUTLER.

THE EXCELLENCE OF REVEALED RELIGION. By C. G. Challenger, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 5s.

This is a very valuable piece of work—almost a masterpiece of combined condensation and lucidity. In these ninety-seven pages Mr. Challenger has provided an admirable survey of the history of the conception of Revelation in Christian times. He has also done more: he gives us, through a critique of that conception, a careful presentation of the idea of Revelation as it is available for the modern mind. This work should gain a wide circulation, for it sets forth some necessary elements of the apologetic of Christianity for the present day.



From the earliest Christian times the growth of a gradually clarified attitude towards the historical documents of the faith emerged, and kept pace with a developing attitude towards philosophy. Hence came the (often sharply contrasted) distinction between a natural enlightenment and that knowledge which is distinctively Christian. Stressed to an extreme degree that separation becomes the definite contrast between Reason and Revelation. This, with the description of Revelation as supra-rational, left as a heritage for us the assumed conflict between Faith and Reason. So we find, at last, Natural Religion set over against Christianity, and *per contra* the "doctrine of an infallible book," and today various types of irrationalism in religion.

Mr. Challenger clearly shows the dependence of an apologetic which has emancipated itself from this vicious circle upon the *objectivity* of the religious experience in its own right. Towards the end of this little work he sets forth religion as "the work of personalities" and the Prophet as the most "excellent" instrument of Revelation. His work leaves off, almost abruptly, where it becomes most illuminating, and it might be wished that Mr. Challenger had allowed himself some more space for a critical defence and illumination of this profound diction. It is much indeed, however, that he should so set our feet in the right path. It is a work on "foundations"; the value of such, "well and truly laid," would most of all disclose itself in the superstructure.

F. W. BUTLER.

THE NEW LEARNING AND THE OLD FAITH. By A. W. Robinson, D.D.  
Longmans. 3s. 6d.

This little book may be taken as a part of that *Nunc dimittis* which the late Canon speaks of himself as preparing to sing. Chapter I. is an address on the development of Theology during the last fifty years, in which the author draws out the hopefulness of the change which has come over the relations of theology to natural science, historical criticism, and philosophy. Chapter II. is a lecture in which he balances Development and Scripture. It is a delicate operation, delicately performed, though it might perhaps be thought to make insufficient allowance for the immense difference between the outlook of Newman and that of Tyrrell. Chapters III. and IV. are of a more devotional character, the former on "God's Purpose for the World," the latter on "What is a Christian?"

K. D. MACKENZIE.



# INDEX OF VOLUME XVIII

JANUARY—JUNE, 1929

	PAGE
Agape, The . . . . .	156
American Episcopal Church, Convention of . . . . .	33
Appearance to St. James, The . . . . .	189
Authority, Review of . . . . .	208, 335
BADCOCK, J. S. . . . .	143
BISHOP, W. S. . . . .	306
BLOODGOOD, F. J. . . . .	33
Books Reviewed:	
Abyssinia, The Church of. By H. M. Hyatt . . . . .	298
Anaphoras of the Ethiopic Liturgy. By J. M. Harden . . . . .	295
Archbishop Davidson. By Sidney Dark . . . . .	238
Australian Church, Constitutional History of. By R. A. Giles . . . . .	226
Authority of the Bible, The. By C. H. Dodd . . . . .	233
<i>Bilânesse d. Martin Luthers.</i> By G. Stuhlfauth . . . . .	45
Building of the Church of Christ, The. By Dr. Headlam . . . . .	162
Cærimoniale in Missa. By C. Callewaert . . . . .	232
Child's Religion, The. By Pierre Bovet . . . . .	291
Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit, The. By H. Wheeler Robinson, D.D. . . . .	283
Christian Guidance of the Social Instincts, The. By J. M. Cole and F. C. Bacon . . . . .	120
Christian Thought. By F. W. Butler . . . . .	354
Church, The. Edited by C. Lattey . . . . .	239
Common Principles in Psychology and Physiology. By J. T. MacCurdy . . . . .	53
Development of Sacramentalism, The. By J. W. C. Wand . . . . .	232
Ethical Studies. By F. H. Bradley . . . . .	116
Faith that Rebels, The. By D. S. Cairns . . . . .	45
Franciscans and Dominicans of Exeter. By A. G. Little . . . . .	50
Genius of Hebrew Grammar, The. By T. H. Robinson. . . . .	50
Goddess of Mercy, The. By J. L. Stewart . . . . .	119
Gospel and its Tributaries, The. By E. F. Scott . . . . .	353
Gospel before the Gospels, The. By B. S. Easton. . . . .	293
Gospel of St. Paul, The. By Sidney Cave . . . . .	177
Gospels and Modernism, The. By A. E. Baker . . . . .	297
Grammar of Greek N.T. By H. E. Dana and J. R. Mantey . . . . .	48
Holy Spirit, The. By A. J. Macdonald . . . . .	57
Holy Spirit in St. Paul. By R. Birch Hoyle . . . . .	231
Homes of the Psalms. By Stacy Waddy . . . . .	236
Ideas and Ideals. By Hastings Rashdall . . . . .	55
<i>Idee der Toleranz im England, die.</i> By M. Freund . . . . .	58
Incarnate Lord, The. By L. S. Thornton . . . . .	289
Instructions on the Religious Life. By R. M. Benson . . . . .	238
Intelligence and Mental Growth. By C. A. Claremont . . . . .	231
John Bunyan. By G. B. Harrison . . . . .	47
<i>L'Eglise Russe.</i> By N. Brian-Chaninov . . . . .	237
Moslem Mentality. By L. Levonian . . . . .	285
New Commentary, A. . . . .	108
New and Living Way, The. By T. H. Passmore . . . . .	171
New Horizons of Christian Faith. By F. C. Grant . . . . .	294
New Spirit in Anglo-Catholicism, The. By F. Underhill . . . . .	297
Old Testament Essays. By R. H. Kennett . . . . .	351
<i>Orthodox Christentum des Ostens, Das.</i> By S. Zankov . . . . .	237
O.T. in Greek (Vatican) . . . . .	49
Our Lord and Saviour. By Peter Green . . . . .	176
Parochial Missions Today. By Peter Green . . . . .	175
Philosophical Theology. By F. R. Tennant. . . . .	167
Pre-Existence and Reincarnation. By W. Lutoslawski . . . . .	119
Ramon Lull. By E. Allison Peers . . . . .	348
Real Presence, The. By A. C. Bouquet . . . . .	172
Relativity and Religion. By H. D. Anthony . . . . .	172
Religion of the Semites. By W. R. Smith . . . . .	42
Religion without God. By F. J. Sheen . . . . .	234
Russian Church since the Revolution. By G. P. Fedotoff . . . . .	52
Ruth. By A. R. S. Kennedy . . . . .	290
<i>S. Gregoire le Grand.</i> By Mgr. Batiffol . . . . .	51
Second Isaiah, The. By C. C. Torrey . . . . .	113
Shining Mystery of Jesus, The. By D. Edwards . . . . .	54
Short Notices . . . . .	59, 177, 295, 299
Souls in the Making. By J. G. McKenzie . . . . .	292
Spiritual Direction. By T. W. Pym . . . . .	38



Books Reviewed—*continued*:

	PAGE
Struggle for Catholic Emancipation. By D. Gwyn	294
Suffering of the Impassible God, The. By B. R. Brasnett	46
Summa Contra Gentiles. By Th. Aquinas	175
Teaching Church, The	49
Text of Revelation, The. By J. Oman	58
Thinking Aloud. By H. Anson	52
Thoughts of St. Bernard. By W. W. Williams	298
Treasury of the Faith	291
Taoist Pearl, A. By A. P. Quentin	56
Vision of God, The. By Nicholas of Cusa	46
Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, The. By G. Milligan	57
Wanderer's Way, A. By C. E. Raven	174
Wrestle of Religion with Truth. By H. N. Wieman	296
BRABANT, F. H.	18, 289
BROWNE-WILKINSON, A. R.	149, 322
Christian Sacraments	11, 78, 137, 279
Church Statistics	102
CLARKE, W. K. L.	5, 156, 216
Conscience	143
Copyright of New Prayer Book	5
Correspondence	278
COULTON, G. G.	94
Cross and Altar	18
DARBYSHIRE, Archdeacon	197
DODD, J. T.	189
DUNKLEY, E. H.	252
Eastern Christendom, Churches of	252
Editorial	1, 61, 121, 181, 241, 301
Evolution and the Modernist	122
France, Church in	265, 328
GIBBINS, H. J.	272
GUILLAXME, A.	42, 113, 285
<i>Hausafeln, Die</i>	216
HENDERSON, A.	25
HOBHOUSE, S.	6, 188
HUBBARD, A. J.	122
Incarnation, The	204
KIRK, K. E.	108
KNOX, W. I.	86
LACEY, T. A.	226
Lausanne and Bangalore	242
MACKENZIE, K. D.	38
MALDEN, R. H.	204
Method of the Catechism, The	322
Mind and Faith	25
Miscellanea	33, 101, 156, 216, 278, 342
Ode to Christ Crucified	159
PALMER, C. H.	265, 328
Passion of God, The.	127
Pentecost	272
Periodicals, Notes on	36, 105, 219, 342
Personal Identity and Resurrection	182
PORTER, W. S.	159
PRESTIGE, G. L.	208, 335
QUICK, O. C.	279
Religious Education, New Prospect	149
RELTON, H. M.	167, 282
Renn Dickson Hampden	259, 313
Roman Canon Law	94
Sin and Salvation	66
SMYTH, C. H.	259, 313
SPENS, W.	11, 78
STRATTON, J. W.	127
Structure of O.T. Religion	197
TAYLOR, E. A.	116
Thoughts on the Trinity	306
TURNER, C. H.	242
WHITNEY, J. P.	162



